Dup K

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XX. NO. 39. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1860. WHOLE NO. 1,027.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.
PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,
AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, No. 5 Beekman Street, New York,
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
107 *North Fifth St., above Arch, Philadelphia.*

Letters for publication, or relating in any way to the editorial conduct of the paper, should be addressed, "*Editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

Letters enclosing subscriptions, or relating in any way to the business affairs of the paper, should be addressed, "*Publisher of the National Anti-Slavery Standard, New York.*"

RATE OF ADVERTISING, 10 cents per line each insertion.

THE STANDARD.

THE AMERICAN BOARD AND AMERICAN SLAVERY.

SPEECH OF THEODORE TILTON IN REPLY TO HENRY WARD BEECHER.*

REPORTED BY W. H. BURR.

My very dear friend, to whose speech I now undertake to reply, was so frank and generous, last Monday evening, in his allusions to some of the young men of this Church, who, growing up for years under his teachings, had at last found themselves differing in certain points from their teacher, that I cannot but tarry a moment, at the threshold of my argument, to thank him for his kindness. I think, sir, you will agree with me, it was characteristic of the man. It was a fresh instance of that large-heartedness, that generosity, that warmth of nature that have won for him the admiration and affection not only of the young men of his Church, but of the old men—and not only of his Church, but everywhere. I remember reading of a nobleman of the Court of Queen Elizabeth, who thought it a sufficient honor to himself to be called "the friend of Sir Philip Sidney." On very many occasions, both in private and in public, I have been received into new circles of society as the friend of the pastor of this Church; and I am sure that never in my life have I been more proud of any introduction! When Louis Kossuth called Walter Savage Landor his friend, the old poet lifted up his hands and exclaimed, "Henceforth, no man can honor me!" I need not say to any member of this Church that I love its minister, almost as I love no other man! Nor need I say that when I come to-night to speak in opposition to his views, it is from no lack of good-fellowship or good feeling towards him; for, standing in this pulpit, in the presence of this Church which has grown up under his labors and his prayers, I am willing now to invoke upon him the blessing of God, and to pray that he may be sustained with unabated strength in his noble and successful service in this Church of Jesus Christ, until, after many years, he shall be as old and white-haired as that venerable man, his father, who now, past four-score, has travelled up so near to the summit of the Mount of Vision that his head is already among its snows, waiting to break through into the glory beyond!

My friend's generous words, on Monday night, were of themselves a sufficient rebuke to those gentlemen who so privately, yet industriously, have labored to make it appear, to the minds of many on whose votes shall rest the decision of this debate, that when a young man in this Church ventures to speak a word in opposition to words spoken by the minister, the act is to be frowned upon as presumptuous and impertinent. I come to this platform because, having been a member of this Church for well nigh seven years, the teachings which I have received in this place, delivered from this desk, have led me hither by their own natural force. For I may truly say that I am indebted for my anti-slavery convictions to the instructions of the pastor of this Church. It is, therefore, Mr. Beecher's own strong right hand that has drawn me to the opposite side of this question! I never have believed in the old dogma that the "king can do no wrong," nor will I believe in the newer dogma, which seems to prevail to a too great extent throughout the Church, that the "minister can say no wrong." Therefore I speak, and speak freely.

In the beginning, I beg to remind the audience that this discussion, although it be with respect to the disposition of collected funds, is nevertheless not one of money, but of principle. I say this to disabuse the mind of my friend, the Rev. Mr. Field, of *The Evangelist*, whom I met yesterday at dinner, and who proposed, as the easiest solution of our difficulties, that we should settle the question by "dividing the money among the principal speakers!" (Laughter).

The main question—not the technical question, but the main question which underlies this discussion—the great illuminated background against which the present subject stands out in strong relief—is the system of American slavery and the relation which the American Church bears, and ought to bear, to it.

I need not, to-night, characterize with any new terms of condemnation that system which crushes down four millions of human beings, in this nation, to a level so low that other men's feet are set upon their necks! I will not draw any fresh picture of its horrors! It is enough to say that it is a system which denies to men their own manhood; that strikes down womanhood with despoiling lust; that lays violent hands on little children, disregarding every plea of pity; that sunders every sacred, domestic tie; that, with cruel oppression, crushes down God's children, and, in the moment of its cruelty, points to God's Word for precedent, and to God's Church for the protecting shadow of its spire! I call your attention to the fact that the American Church is in complicity with this system to an extent which you will scarcely credit when I give you the facts and figures. Listen a moment! I have an authentic table of statistics, from which it appears that the number of slaves owned by ministers and members of the Methodist Church is—how many do you think? Why, 219,000!

Mr. Beecher—That is, I suppose, in the Methodist Church South?

Mr. Tilton—No, sir; in the Church South and North together; for both hold slaves. The number of slaves owned by ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church, Old School and New, is 77,000; by Baptists, 125,000; by Reformed Baptists (I don't think they are altogether reformed), 101,000; by Episcopalians, 88,000; by all other denominations (and I am glad that in the paper from which I read our own denomination is not put down by name), about 55,000; making altogether a sum total of more than 600,000 human beings—men, women and children!—for whom the walls of the Christian Church are only a prison! Think of it! In this nineteenth century, after the gospel of Christianity has been for nearly two thousand years working its way into the hearts of men, the Church—claiming Christ as its founder, and attempting to lead men along the only way to the gate of Heaven—holds six hundred thousand human beings in personal and life-long bondage to its ministers and members! I do not wonder that Albert Barnes said, if it were not for the American Church, American slavery could not exist for an hour! You must remember, too, that this great multitude of slaves, held by church-members and church-ministers, are held everywhere under one and the same pretence. The universal plea is that "the circumstances are justifiable"! No slaveholder who communes with a Church will dare to open his mouth and say to the world that he holds his slaves as the mass of slave-owners outside the Church hold theirs. He denies that he keeps his human property for his selfish profit, and puts forth, instead, the miserable pretence that his oppression is meant for the slaves' moral and religious instruction, and their highest spiritual good! Nothing is more common in the Church than the apology that slavery is a benign missionary institution!

Now, I wish this Church to aid in no way, not even by the smallest contribution, any Society or Board that is in complicity with this cruel system. I shall attempt to prove that the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions is at this moment in complicity with this wrong and crime. If I prove this, it will, of course, follow that this Church ought at once to sever its connection with this Board.

But, in the first place, allow me to express my surprise at the way in which my friend undertook to vindicate the American Board. One of his strong arguments—and it struck me with great astonishment!—was that this was a "venerable institution"! I say it struck me with astonishment; for I have heard him declare, in this very pulpit, that he "would never be moved by reverence one step even towards the worship of God!" Nay, sir, standing in the presence of hoary institutions that have claimed honor on account of age, he has always exclaimed, "No! I have iron knees! I will not bow down!" And yet, on Monday night, he said, and repeated it again and again, "The American Board is a venerable institution!" Sir, what if it be venerable? It is not therefore sacred! My friend will pardon me if I say that when he offered that vindication, I took it as a sarcasm—equalled only by the exquisite humor that lay unconsciously hid under another argument which he immediately afterward alleged, that he loved the American Board because, in his early life, he had driven fast horses with some of the missionaries! (Laughter.)

But the most significant part of my friend's address was his plea for the admission of slaveholders into the Church. I confess, sir, this was new to me! For during seven years past, up to Monday night, if anybody had asked me, "Would Plymouth Church, under any circumstances, admit a slaveholder to its membership?" I would have answered most unqualifiedly, "No." I do not now refer to Mr. Beecher's ingenious and adroit explanation of "immediate emancipation," nor to his very humorous references, often made in this pulpit, to "slavery *per se*." The question is not whether it is possible instantaneously, without a moment's flight of time between the will and the deed, for a slaveholder to emancipate his slave; nor whether you cannot conceive of a case of slaveholding which is not a sin *per se*; but whether a Christian Church, looking upon men who own and hold slaves, shall take to herself, what the world will be very ready to give, the reproach of their admission into her fellowship! For, granting, for the argument's sake, that a slaveholder may, in some rare, infrequent instance, hold to-day without guilt a slave whom he means to set free to-morrow—holding him not as a slave, but as a man—holding him not in a moral enslavement, but under the mere hollow shell of some legal bond that cannot at this moment be broken—granting that there can be such a case (and no one will deny that there may, although the owner is then the unwilling master of a voluntary slave, and therefore not a slaveholder, but a man-holder), the question is, Shall such a man, standing in such a relation, be received into a Church which is commanded to obey the apostolic injunction to avoid even the appearance of evil?

Now, this is the best possible or supposable case. But in fifteen free States, even such a possible case is made impossible on their own soil; for if a slave be brought into New York, by his master's consent, the slave is free by law, the moment he crosses the line. A master cannot bring his slave into a free State under such a regulation as my friend proposes to establish for a Church. If, therefore, when a State says to a master, bringing his slave across its borders, "The slave is free!" do we make any extraordinary demand when we turn to the Church and ask it to say the same thing? to say that when a slaveholding church-member, standing in his pew, turns round and sees his own slave coming up the aisle to take a seat at the communion-table, the Church should call out to the slave, as the State calls out, "From the moment you have crossed my threshold, you are free!" Tell me, sir, shall the Christian Church be behind the legislative progress of fifteen States?

A slaveholder is a man and something more—a man with a chattel. Now, I would make the doors of the Church so narrow that when the man tries to get in, the chattel that clings to him shall be rubbed off and dropped behind!

But do you tell me that it is illiberal to exclude from a Church a slave-owner who can prove that he stands in this supposable innocent relation to his slave? I reply that if the Church were itself liberal in all other respects—if it were to break down its high strong walls and widen its platform to all the world—if an evangelical Church would admit a Christian man to membership even if he were a Unitarian or a Universalist—if an orthodox congregation would give their fellowship and open their membership to a sincere and devout Roman Catholic (and my friend has said, in this pulpit, that many a Roman Catholic has been a sincere Christian)—then, I say, I will have no objection to the admission into the Church of a pious and devout slaveholder, whenever you can find such a rarity in the land! But so long as a Church employs a committee to sit at its gates, as the elders sat at the gates of Jerusalem, to make inquisition of every man who knocks for admission—to inquire of every new applicant what is his belief, and what is his practice—so long as no man is allowed to come in who denies certain articles in our creed, or who indulges in certain sins and peccadilloes which our Church condemns—so long as the Church determines to be stringent with her candidates in all these respects, then, sir, I say, let her be equally stringent in her inquiries of every man who comes to her threshold carrying in his hands the symbols of bondage by which he holds his fellow-men under the yoke! That is all I ask!

Is this unreasonable? Look at it! A man applies for admission to this Church. My friend, Mr. Corning, is a member of the Examining Committee. He puts close questions to the stranger. Mr. Corning is a well-known temperance man; and he asks, "Do you use intoxicating liquors as a beverage?" or "Do you sell liquor?" "Yes, sir," is the reply. "Then you cannot come into the membership of this Church." "But," says the man to my friend, questioning him in return, "do you believe that to drink a glass of wine is a sin *per se*?" Mr. Corning cannot say "yes." "Do you believe that to sell a gallon of whiskey is a sin *per se*?" Mr. Corning cannot say "yes." Nevertheless, Mr. Corning does not hesitate to declare that the man must not be admitted! But when, instead of a rumseller, there comes a slaveholder knocking at the door of Christ's fold, what is Mr. Corning's reply? Why, Mr. Corning would ask him a few preliminary questions about justificatory circumstances, and then say, "Come in! come in!" But, sir, if you exclude a dram-drinker, without stopping to prove a sin *per se*, how can you admit a slaveholder, under the apology of no sin *per se*?

But Mr. Corning took especial pains to say, a few evenings ago, that he would stand on the platform of the Temperance Society side by side with slaveholders. Suppose he would; what has that to with standing side by side with them in the Church? No Christian profession is required of a man who enters the Temperance Society. If only he be opposed to strong drink, he may believe in every heresy that ever a Church barred out of its creed. Yet, when Mr. Corning spoke so warmly and earnestly of a certain Southern slaveholder, whom he almost mentioned by name—a man prominent in the Temperance Union—a man with whom, as he said, he was not ashamed to stand anywhere, by which I suppose he meant in the Church or out, I could not help saying to myself, "Ah! Mr. Corning, I can tell you a story of that man!" Let me tell it now! The man is a Judge in a Southern Court. A negro was once brought before him for trial, whose offence consisted in having fallen in love with a slave girl, and in afterward attempting to steal her away by night to marry her. He was caught, convicted and sentenced. And what was the sentence? It was the dark decree of *death!*—as if the crime had been murder! When the Judge was written to in remonstrance by some gentlemen in the North, he replied, by return mail, that he had awarded the sentence on the authority of the Holy Bible—adding, "I am surprised that you should have overlooked the text: 'He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death!'" Now, it may be very safe for Mr. Corning to call this gentleman to his side, to stand with him in mutual coöperation on the Temperance platform, but what would Mr. Corning's friends in this Church say if they were to see him calling out to this same chivalric South Carolina Judge to come and sit by his side at the communion-table spread out in front of this pulpit, and under this roof!

But, sir, we are not called upon to deal with romantic, ideal cases of slaveholding, where the bondage is no bondage, but only the shadow of it. We are called upon to deal with slavery as black men experience it at the hands of red men; slavery in which slaves are held not because it is impossible to free them; not because they could not take care of themselves if they were free; not because they are old or infirm; but because the masters who own them would lose their market-value by emancipating them; because they are house-servants who are still every day needed to do the service of the house; because, belonging to owners, their owners require that they should be put to a profitable use. I need not say that they are inhumanly treated. I do not mean that any man shall trip me up to-night on the easy charge that I am a fanatic. These slaves, on whose slavery falls the solemn and silent shadow of the American Board, are held in the same common bondage with the great mass of their brethren who suffer servitude at the hands of ministers and members of the great American Church. In a word, they are deprived of their liberty without their consent. This is enough, even if nothing else be added. It is against such slaveholding as this—actual, not imaginary—real, and not ideal—that I ask this Church to bear its testimony.

Now, sir, I had always supposed that, holding these views, I held them in common with the pastor of this Church. A remark was reported to me the other day, since this discussion began, that when the Congregational Church in the other district of this city, of which a brother of Mr. Beecher was chosen minister, met in council to decide upon a form of government, the inquiry arose as to whether they should put into the covenant a provision in reference to the exclusion of slaveholders. Our pastor said, "In the covenant of Plymouth Church, there is no such provision; but we have an examining committee who are sharp enough to detect any rumseller or slaveholder; and you may be sure that neither the one nor the other would ever get in!" Moreover, I have the printed testimony of the pastor of this Church in which he denies the very position he took the other night! I can quote Henry Ward Beecher against Henry Ward Beecher (laughter). Listen while I read from a report of a speech delivered from this desk, and on this very subject, in the year 1855. After speaking of the American Home Missionary Society, he says:

"But there is another Society that solicits your benefactions—the American Missionary Association. This is an Anti-Slavery Missionary Society, and a large number of you, I know, are interested in it. It has missionaries in the slave States, who establish Churches that refuse fellowship with slaveholders. *That is right; they ought to be* BARRED OUT EVERYWHERE!"

Now, this is quoting the gentleman point blank against himself. Well, what does it mean? It means this. In 1855 a slaveholder knocks at the door of Plymouth Church, and Mr. Beecher, hearing the rap, says, "Bar him out!" In the year 1860 the slaveholder knocks at the same door, and Mr. Beecher, after five years' reflection, says, "Let him in!"

A Voice—No!

Mr. Tilton—No? Let me report the rumors of the streets and the market-place! Wherever I go, whether in the stage, in the railroad car, in the ferry-boat, or on foot up and down the streets, I am perpetually accosted with the question, "Is the pastor of Plymouth Church changing his views? Is Mr. Beecher growing more conservative?" I have always answered these salutations with an emphatic No; and until Monday night I always believed No. But what am I now to say if my friend puts up the bars in 1855, only to let them down in 1860? Martin Luther nailed to the church door at Wittemberg his ninety-five propositions and challenged all the world to dispute them. I have many a time heard the pastor of this Church called the new Martin Luther of the nineteenth century. Five years ago, he nailed upon his church door the declaration that no rumseller or slaveholder should be admitted to fellowship inside. Does he now tear down the parchment that has been hanging on these doors ever since I knew this Church? Nay, sir, will he pluck away the greenest leaves of the laurel that has been growing greener and greener about his head for thirty years? Everybody asks, "Is he changing?" I reply only, "Everybody says he is!" I beg of him, if this be an unjust impression which everybody holds, to rid the public mind of it at once; I beg of him to clear away such an imputation—in justice to himself, in justice to this Church, in justice to the Lord Jesus whose minister he is!

Now, sir, I charge the American Board with complicity with slavery because it sustains the Cherokee mission. During the last ten or fifteen years, there has been, among the Churches that patronize the Board, a discussion on the subject of the Choctaw and Cherokee missions. The anti-slavery sentiment has always been directed against these two missions, as putting the Board in complicity with slavery. Last year, the Choctaw mission was cut off—for what reasons I will not here state. The general impression among the Churches is that the Cherokee mission was cut off with the Choctaw, and that, therefore, no slavery now remains, to subject the Board any longer to the charge of oppression. Only yesterday, I met the Rev. Mr. Houghton, editor of the *American Presbyterian*, who said to me, "What are you discussing in your Church?" I replied, "The complicity of the American Board with slavery in its missions among the Indians." "But," said he, "the Board have cut off the Choctaws, and have so cut off slavery." "Yes," said I, "but they still retain the Cherokees." "What!" he inquired, "is there slaveholding among the Cherokees?" So here was an editor of a religious newspaper published in Philadelphia who did not know that the Cherokee mission was still in connection with the American Board, and that slaveholders were in connection with the mission. A similar erroneous impression prevails widely among the Christian public.

If you look at that map [pointing to a large map behind the platform], you will see that the Cherokees occupy the whole north of Indian Territory, and the Choctaws the whole south. The territory of the Cherokees is about as large as the State of Massachusetts. These Indians are famous slaveholders. I have received direct information from a black man now in Kansas—who was formerly a slave in the South—who has been bought and sold at different times in and out of three different States of the Union—who was at last bought by a Cherokee owner, from whom he ran away and escaped into Kansas. For slaves run out of the Cherokee nation into Kansas, just as, nearer home, they run out of Delaware and Maryland into Pennsylvania. This man declares that he did not suffer in any State such cruel bondage as among the Cherokees. Why? Because the masters are Indians and have been savages. It is natural to suppose that oppression is more cruel under Indians than under whites. I have word also from another slave in Kansas, who goes by the name of "Cherokee Bill"; and he gives a similar testimony.

I will mention another circumstance to show the character of slavery among the Cherokees. If a fugitive escapes from Missouri into Kansas, and the owner sends a slave-catcher after him, the hunter, if a successful hunt has yielded him his prey, sometimes carries him back to his master, to be repaid by the proceeds of half the slave's value realized in cash at public auction, but very often, instead of carrying him back, he marches him across the Kansas line into the Cherokee nation, to sell him captive to the Indians, from whom often he can get more money than a mere half price! So that the slave-hunters carry on a double knavery; first, catching the slaves when they escape, and, then, when they are caught, taking them to more rigorous masters, who will pay a higher price.

Such are some of the features of slave-hunting and slaveholding as practised by the Cherokees!

I now undertake to review the historic action of the American Board on the subject of slavery, with a view to show its lamentable complicity with this terrible system as it exists among these Indians.

Mr. Beecher began his review, in detail, at 1845; I begin mine at 1841. At the meeting of that year, held in Philadelphia, a memorial was presented from seventeen ministers of New Hampshire, most of whom were honorary members of the Board, asking it to break what appeared to them "a studied silence on the subject of American slavery." The memorialists said:

"We do think that American slavery is such—and brought, in the providence of God, so distinctly into the notice of American Christians—that no man or body of men can innocently maintain a doubtful position in relation to it."

What did the Board reply? They replied:

"In regard to the particular object of the memorialists—that of obtaining a formal expression of the views and feelings of the Board respecting slavery—your Committee *do not think that such a measure is called for, or that it would be right or expedient!*"

At the next meeting, which was in Norwich, Ct., in 1842, the attention of the Board was called to the question, "whether any, or, if any, how many, of its missionaries were slaveholders." It then appeared that the Prudential Committee had, for six years, had a letter in their hands, written by one of their missionaries, *stating the fact of his holding slaves.* For six years! Yes, sir; and during all this time his letter was lying in the Missionary House, suppressed by the Committee. Yet Mr. Beecher said (I believe, without his knowing the facts) that, from the beginning until now, the Board had acted up to its highest light and had kept pace with the progress of the times on the subject of slavery! But the Board said of slavery, that very year:

"We consider it as one of the obvious evils which exist in the community, the removal of which, though we regard it as an object of fervent desire and prayer, does *not fall within our province as a Missionary Board.* These are our *settled* principles."

But the memorialists urged that the Board had taken occasion to condemn other evils, and why not slavery, the sum of evils? To this the Board replied:

"It is alleged by the memorialists that the Board has departed from these principles and has expressed opinions relative to other prevailing evils. Respecting intemperance, licentiousness, Indian oppression, and some other hindrances to the progress of Christianity, as they prevailed in the countries where the missions of the Board are established, and powerfully counteracted the labors of the missionaries, and in some instances subjected them to great peril, *the Board has stated the facts as they occurred, and in various forms, more or less explicit, has uttered the language of condemnation.* These evils, existing in the countries where the missions are operating, and standing directly in the way of the Board's accomplishing its object, *were, of course, legitimate and proper subjects for its animadversion.* If it has at any time gone further than this, and expressed opinions relative to immoralities or evils of any kind, prevailing in this country, *and not directly counteracting the labors of the missionaries,* your Committee regard such action as a departure from the great principles on which the Board was organized, and by which they think its proceedings should always be governed."

Now, what is the meaning of these words? Sir, they mean that intemperance, licentiousness and Indian oppression are hindrances to the missions; but that slavery is no hindrance! That is a Christian discrimination for you! Yet Mr. Beecher, in speaking of the Board as it stood in 1845, said, "You must remember the general sentiment on temperance then—how lax it was." But even three years before 1845, in 1842, the Board was already *leading* public sentiment on this subject; it had already expressed unequivocally its condemnation of intemperance among the Cherokees; it had done this notwithstanding what my friend called the "general laxity of public sentiment in respect to intemperance"; but at the same time, it let slavery *entirely alone.*

You perceive that it bore testimony against licentiousness. What is the most fruitful cause of licentiousness in a slaveholding country? Slavery! And why? Because it breaks down all barriers to honor, because it despoils chastity, because it invades the sanctity of the family, because it destroys every personal right! Yet the Board, in testifying against these separate evils, said not a single word against that which was at that very time the fruitful mother of them all!

The report speaks of "Indian Oppression!" Ah, yes! how near it came to saying the right word! It saved itself only by making it plainly appear that "Indian oppression" meant oppression by Indians in the East, not by Indians in the West!

The next meeting was at Worcester, in 1844. The memorials kept pouring in! Yet, if the Board was really up with the spirit of the times, why was it troubled with such a host of memorials? What did the memorialists ask? They said:

"We ask the Board earnestly to entreat all the missionaries and agents under its patronage to bear decided testimony against the sin of oppression, wherever and in whatever form it exists; and most especially to declare, in the name of the Board, of the Churches represented by it, and of Jesus Christ whom they preach, that American slavery is a sin against God, and that its existence in a Christian land is in nowise chargeable to the Christian religion which they are commissioned to preach, but is grossly at variance with all its holy doctrines and precepts. *And we further pray that the Board would immediately take measures to ascertain to what extent slavery or oppression exists in the Churches under its patronage, and especially among the Choctaws and other Indian tribes; and take such action at this meeting as shall speedily remove the evil, or exonerate them and their missionaries from all the responsibility and guilt of its continuance or toleration.*"

Now, my friend says we must remember the difference in public sentiment between that time and this. But this appeal in 1844 is all we ask in 1860! We ask no more now than those memorialists asked then! But so far from the Board keeping pace with the times on this subject, before the very next annual meeting the Rev. Amos A. Phelps wrote and left on record these words:

"The position of the Board, from the beginning of the present movement in behalf of the slave, is that of *resistance to the general progress on the side of slavery.*"

It is too late, therefore, for Mr. Beecher to say in 1860 that the Board kept pace with the progress of the age, when in 1844, an eye witness of the progress which the age was making declared that the Board was resisting that general progress, and on the side of slavery!

What was done by the Board in that year? They quoted their declaration of the preceding year, adding only these words:

"It is quite certain that, without a change of views, the Board can do nothing beyond this."

A change of views! That is what I charge—that they needed a change of views! They had not yet been converted to anti-slavery sentiment. In genuine conversion there are two things, namely, a change of views and a change of conduct. The Board had not then come even to a change of views!

Then followed the meeting in 1845, with which Mr. Beecher began his speech. So long ago as that year, he said, the Board gave utterance to anti-slavery principles. He quoted from the annual report an allusion to Dr. Chalmers's admission that slaveholding was not necessarily sinful. The words of the quotation were scarcely out of his mouth before a note, written in lead-pencil, was passed to me in my seat by a stranger in the audience. It was in these words:

"The opinion of Dr. Chalmers and others of the Scotch Free Church was delivered at a time when a deputation had visited the United States to collect funds for the support of the Free Church. The people of Scotland (the Dissenters) held public meetings, at which it was urged that the Free Church should '*cast back to America the impious gift.*'"

More than that, when I went to my office next morning, I found on my desk a note from another gentleman to whom Mr. Beecher referred by name, in reading his quotation from Dr. Chalmers; I mean Mr. M'Kay, a Scotchman and a member of Plymouth Church. I will read part of it:

"I ask you to *vindicate 'Auld Scotia' for her own sake, and for mine.* In the year 1843, the 'Disruption' gave birth to the Free Church of Scotland. They were in want of money, and sent a deputation from Scotland to these United States for the purpose of collecting their sympathy and assistance. They went to the Southern States, received the hospitality and contributions of slaveholders and slaveholding Churches, and this in spite of a protest made to them on their arrival at New York. They went back to Scotland with a good deal of money—and a great deal of disgrace (laughter); and from the Tweed to John O'Groat's the Free Church became a hissing and a bye-word, so much so that you might have seen placarded, around the streets of Edinburgh, 'Send back the money—Send back the money.'"

Mr. Beecher—Did they send it back? (Laughter.)

Mr. Tilton—I do not know; but they ought to have sent it back (renewed laughter and applause). So much for Dr. Chalmers!

Now, this report of 1845 cites some facts, among which I select two. It says:

"In Christian instruction and care, both of their children and their slaves, the missionaries represent these Indian church-members as being *generally and often greatly deficient.*"

Also,

"Among the Cherokees and Choctaws the church-members are but poorly qualified to give religious instruction; and often the slaves—owing to their better knowledge of the English language, and consequently their easier intercourse with the missionaries and others—*are more intelligent on religious subjects than their masters.*"

And yet Mr. Beecher thinks that the Report of 1845 expresses a true sentiment on the subject of slavery. What sentiment does it express? Not that an ignorant slave shall be held by a kind-hearted master and trained and educated, until he shall at last be lifted up into the light and liberty of the sons of God; but that an *intelligent* slave, well-informed on religious subjects, having the grace of God in his heart, shall be held in bondage by an ignorant man, who wrongly treats not only his own slaves, but his own children!

I need not ask him to answer whether that is a "true sentiment on the subject of slavery"!

In view of these facts, laid before the Board, what was done? Nothing! Mark you, the Board knew that ignorant men, unable to take care of their own children, were trying to take care of slaves who knew more than their masters; and yet the Board, knowing full well, from the testimony of their own Secretary, that this was the character of these slaveholders, approved their admission to the Mission Churches! Is it possible, then, that Mr. Beecher can believe "the Board was up to the progress of the times on the subject of slavery"? Is it possible that he can say, "I am not ashamed to stand where they stood"?

Ah, sir, what must have been the feelings of those intelligent slaves whom this report so highly compliments?—those slaves who knew more than their masters—those slaves so well informed on religious subjects—those slaves whose minds God had enlightened and whose hearts he had touched with his love?—I ask, sir, what must have been their emotions when this report from the Board reached their hovels and cabins? I think I can almost see the figure of Christ standing once again, as of old, among his poor on earth, and with that divine voice that spake as never man spake, saying, with sad reproach, to that Missionary Board, "*Inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of these, ye did it not unto me!*"

Now, sir, I am willing to admit that there are a great many things in this report that are sound, frank and anti-slavery; but what was the action which followed the words? The action! Was it up to the progress of the age? No, sir! For almost at that very moment—after this message had been sent by the American Board to those slaves—the new Society, the American Missionary Association, sprang into existence as a living protest against the Board's complicity with slavery. It was formed because the Board had proved itself behind the progress of the times. The American Missionary Association arose in testimony against that backwardness; and to-day, every one of its missionaries and agents, every one of its members and contributors, makes a virtual protest against the Board's complicity with slavery. Every one of its distant mission stations—in the West Indies, in Africa, in the Sandwich Islands, among the Copts of Egypt, and nearer home, in Canada, among the Objibue and Ottawa Indians—makes a perpetual protest against that Board! Yes, sir, even among the Indians. For the Indians of one tribe, receiving their religious teachings from the Missionary Association, rise up in protest against the slavery practised by another tribe who are sanctioned in their oppression by the American Board!

Mr. Beecher—I would like to ask whether Mr. Tilton would prefer that any misstatement of fact he makes respecting my speech should be met at the time, or whether I should reserve the correction until he finishes his speech.

Mr. Tilton—I would consult your own preference, not mine, in regard to that.

Mr. Beecher—I did not undertake to say that the Board, in 1841, 2, 3, 5, nor 1848, were up to the standard of the present time, nor up to the standard of some of the most enlightened men of those times. I merely said, comprehensively, that, looking at the Board, in its action from 1845 up to this day, it had been influenced by the times and had come up to their standard.

Mr. Tilton—Any remarks which my friend may make, I shall receive in the spirit of kindness and courtesy.

I now come to the meeting of 1848, held at Boston—the year in which Mr. Treat made his famous report. It will be remembered that my friend compared Mr. Treat's report to the Epistles to the Corinthians! Now, let us see what it is that is so much like the Epistles to the Corinthians (laughter). In respect to the number of slaves, Mr. Treat writes:

"Some say that among the Cherokees there are not more than seven hundred; while others think there are as many as fifteen hundred. The latter is the estimate of the Principal Chief, and it is most likely to be correct. At any rate we must suppose the proportion of slaves to Cherokees to be nearly, if not quite, one to ten. It is hardly possible that persons held in bondage by such a people should be in as favorable circumstances as those who have fallen into the hands of enlightened and humane masters in the States; especially if those masters are under the influence of Christian principle, and are endeavoring to treat their slaves according to the injunctions of the gospel."

Now, these extracts show that these slaves were not in so happy a condition as others in other places, who had access to the New Testament. This deprivation of the Scriptures, however, was soon to be remedied in part; for as soon as Mr. Treat could send them his letter, they would have, if not the whole Scriptures, at least the Epistles to the Corinthians (laughter). I will read some more verses from these Epistles:

"The predominant influence in both nations is mainly in the hands of slaveholders. The intelligence and enterprise which enable them to acquire this species of property also qualify them for an active and successful participation in public affairs. And many belonging to this class would certainly resist, to the utmost, any proposal tending to the abolition of slavery."

Give good heed, for I am quoting from Mr. Beecher's Scriptures (laughter).

"It does not seem to have been the aim of the brethren to exert any *direct* influence, either by their public or their private teachings, upon the system of slavery. And they discovered, as they supposed, a sufficient warrant for this course in the *New Testament.*"

What? In the Epistles to the Corinthians? Yes! For, if not in the old Epistles of St. Paul, at least in the new Epistle of St. Treat! (Laughter.)

Mr. Beecher—I think you have extracted from two documents; the first a letter, the second a report. My remark in reference to the uninspired book of Corinthians (laughter) was to the report and not the letter.

Mr. Tilton—Well, sir, it makes very little difference; both are from Mr. Treat.

What, now, are the views of the missionaries themselves? The missionaries among the Cherokees have said, in a document signed by all their number:

"In regard to the question of rejecting any person from the Church *simply* because he is a *slaveholder*, we cannot for a moment hesitate. For we regard it as *certain that the Apostles, who are our patterns, did receive slaveholders to the communion of the Church*; and we have not yet been able to perceive any such difference between the circumstances and ours as to justify us in departing from their practice in this respect."

Thus they defend slaveholding from the Bible! They say, moreover:

"Nor can we even make it a test of piety, or a condition of admission to the privileges of the Church, that a candidate *should express a determination not to live and die a slaveholder.*"

That is to say, they would not only receive slaveholders, but would not require them to give a pledge that they would not live and die slaveholders. Still further:

"You asked (say the missionaries), among other things, whether we would undertake to discipline a church member for buying or selling slaves as merchandise, for gain."

Now, the letter of the missionaries goes on to give a large number of instances. I will recite one:

"Between the two extremes of purchasing for the slave's sake, and buying and selling with a total disregard of the interest of the slave, *there are many cases of mixed motive, where the buyer or seller might allow that he had regard to his own interest; but yet, as he makes the condition of the slave no worse but perhaps much better, by the transfer, neither he nor most of his brethren in the Church could be led to see that he had been guilty of any violation of the law of love.*"

Oh, yes! That is the argument that seeks to promote the revival of the slave trade! To bring the benighted African to this country to receive the benefits of Christian institutions!

"Occasional exchanges of masters," they add, "are so inseparable from the existence of slavery that the Churches could not consistently receive slaveholders to their communion at all, and at the same time forbid all such exchanges. We regard it, therefore, *as impossible to exercise discipline for the buying or selling of slaves,* except in flagrant cases of manifest disregard to the welfare of the slave."

Is this the commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians? Why, sir, print that and send it to Italy; let it find its way into Florence, where Mrs. Stowe is now residing; say that Henry Ward Beecher's name is at the bottom of it as endorsement; what would Mrs. Stowe say? She would exclaim, with a blush, "It is a forgery of his name!" Nay, sir, the pastor of this Church would himself blush to see his name signed to any such sentiment as that! Buying and selling slaves! What is that but the Slave Trade? And what is the Slave Trade? Ah, sir, on the high seas, it is pronounced piracy, but—wonderful anomaly!—on land it is pronounced Christianity! Yet what is the difference between the horrors of the middle passage and the horrors of the overland passage? What is the difference between the sufferings of the lower deck and the terrors of the chain-gang? None at all, sir! I tell you there is just as much deep despair and hopeless horror in the slave jail as there ever was in the slave ship! And yet these missionaries have set their hand and seal to this paper, which declares that they cannot forbid, even in their own Churches, the buying and selling of men! In other words, under the name of carrying on missionary operations, they are carrying on the slave trade! They say further:

"In regard to the separation of parents and children, we must first remark that it is one of those things which are not forbidden by any *express* INJUNCTION OF SCRIPTURE." * * * * "*Very young children, we believe, are seldom separated from their mothers.* In our Churches, we do not remember to have known an instance. *In regard to older children, many cases may arise where neither the condition of the parent nor that of the child will be rendered worse, but that of one of them may be greatly improved by the proposed separation*; and where it cannot be readily shown to be any more a violation of the law of love than any other transfer of a slave from one master to another. *It is impossible, in our circumstances, to make it a general rule that the separation of parents and children, by sale or purchase, shall be regarded as a disciplinable offence.*"

These are the views of the missionaries! Now, who wrote this statement of principles? It was written by the Rev. Mr. Worcester, whose name signs it. Yet, do you not remember how Mr. Beecher eulogized this same Rev. Mr. Worcester, the other night? You have not yet forgotten how he described him with glowing words as a man in whose veins flowed New England blood, upon whose arms had hung prisoners' chains, and who once had been thrown into a dungeon for Christ's sake! My friend asked, "Could such a man, with such New England blood, be anything else than an anti-slavery man?" But, sir, that was the very man whose hand wrote these lines! Archbishop Cranmer, in a moment of weakness, recanted his Protestant faith; afterwards, when his conscience reproached him, he recanted his recantation; he was soon after brought to suffer at the stake. While the fires of martyrdom were kindling about him, he stretched out his right hand into the flames, and there held it until it was burned off, and fell to ashes, crying out the while, "Unworthy hand! unworthy hand!" Sir, if I had written only the single sentence that I have read from this statement, so quietly and sacredly sanctioning the tearing away of children from their parents, whenever I looked upon the hand that had held the pen, I would have cried out, "Unworthy hand! unworthy hand!"

And yet my friend stood on these boards on Monday night to picture to us, in complimentary strain, the current of New England blood that flowed in this man's veins, and to say, pointing with his emphatic finger, "Here was an anti-slavery man!" Sir [turning to Mr Beecher], I know too well your quick instinct for freedom ever to believe that you were cognizant of these facts when you uttered that eulogy!

But, besides, in regard to the impression which my friend produced, that Mr. Worcester was thrown into prison because of his allegiance to the anti-slavery cause, this is an entire mistake. The facts were simply these: The Cherokee mission was at that time in the State of Georgia. The Legislature of Georgia tried to crowd out the Indians from the State in order to seize their lands. Mr. Worcester, who was at that early day a missionary, defended the Indians. For that reason, and for that reason alone, he was put in jail. There was not a shadow of anti-slavery principle involved in the matter.

Now, what did the Board do after all these statements had been received from the missionaries, at that famous meeting of 1848? Why, sir, Dr. Blanchard, who has since been President of Knox College, offered the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this Board distinctly admits and affirms the principle that slaveholding is a practice which is not to be allowed in the Christian Church."

How was this resolution received? Look at the annual report of 1848! Here is the neat and pretty record. The report remarks:

"Dr. Blanchard having been requested to withdraw these resolutions, consented to do so; and the Board permitted them to be inserted in the minutes of the meeting."

Now, would not any one suppose, on reading these minutes, that Dr. Blanchard, after having offered his resolution, finally came to a sober second thought, and thought it better to withdraw it? Certainly! But turn back to the newspaper files of that day and see what was the sentiment of that meeting. The moment it became apparent that the Board was going to sweep away the resolution, without leaving even so much as a record of it on the minutes, the Rev. Edward Beecher rose to his feet and protested, saying, "Gentlemen, you must not do that!" Dr. Lyman Beecher followed his son, protesting, with all the eloquence of his palmiest days, "Brethren, you must not do that!" But the resolution could not be passed, and the only way to get it on the records at all, in a parliamentary manner, was for Dr. Blanchard to withdraw it. So it was withdrawn, not willingly, but necessarily. But the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher says that, comprehensively, he has agreed to sympathize with the Board from the beginning! Will he sympathize with that against which both his brother and his father protested? His brother Edward was then, as he is now, an older man than he, by some years; and perhaps, therefore, their disparity of views may be put down to the "Conflict of Ages" (loud laughter).

Skipping now the long interval of seven years of silence, we come to the visit of Secretary Wood to the Choctaws and Cherokees, in 1855. We come to the Goodwater document. Mr. Beecher says that the case must stand or fall with the Goodwater document. That paper begins as follows:

"Slavery, as a system, and in its own proper nature, is what it is described to be in the General Assembly's Act of 1818, and the Report of the American Board adopted at Brooklyn in 1845."

I have already read a sufficient part of the report of 1845 to show that it meant nothing. Now, what is the "General Assembly's Act of 1818"?

Here let me ask, Has anybody in this wide land ever been more severe against the Colonization Society than the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher? Every one who is familiar with his speeches will say "No." You know that that Society says to the black man who wants liberty, "You can get it only at the price of expatriation and exile." And yet, by accepting this report of the General Assembly of 1818, the missionaries distinctly declare their adhesion to the principles of the Colonization Society, and express their desire to carry on its work of expatriation!

Still further. Does the testimony of 1818 make the buying and selling of slaves a disciplinable offence? No, only so far as "selling slaves to those who will either themselves deprive these unhappy people of the blessings of the gospel, or who will transport them to places where the gospel is not proclaimed." And yet this document is what Mr. Beecher says he is willing to stand or fall by!

I admit that there are many strong utterances in the General Assembly's Act of 1818; but tell me why this Presbyterian document was sent for signature to a Congregational mission? When the Prudential Committee wanted the missionaries to utter a testimony against slavery, why did they not ask the missionaries to write their testimony with fresh ink and on fresh paper? Why did the Prudential Committee dig up out of the dust a dingy parchment well-nigh fifty years old? The reason is plain! From the very year of the signing of that document down through all the long lapse of time until to-day, *that act has been a dead letter.* I speak the truth! No man can gainsay it! For, what kind of testimony is that, against slavery, under which, as I have already read, there has grown up a Presbyterian Church which at this moment is holding in bonds thousands and tens of thousands of human beings! Under the shadow of that Act of 1818, there has been gathered together, in the Presbyterian Church, so great a multitude of slaves, owned by its members and its ministers, that if they were marshalled into one host, they would make an Emperor's grand army! I gave you, from a table of statistics, the exact number—77,000! Listen to a story which the Rev. Mr. Fee, of Kentucky, tells:

"I know the case of a minister in this same Church, and in our State, who, that he might take another man's wife from him (which woman he claimed as his slave, and said to be so white that she was freckled), hastened from house to house on Sabbath morning to hire the sons of Presbyterian elders to go forthwith and hunt his slave woman; and being reproved by a Methodist sister for tempting the young men to go and desecrate the Sabbath, he replied, 'Madam, it is the preacher's nigger.' And yet, that man was and is a preacher in good and regular standing in that body."

This is the kind of anti-slavery sentiment and practice that has grown up in the great Presbyterian Church, Old School and New, under the shadow of the General Assembly's Act of 1818, by which my friend declares he will either stand or fall!

What is the next thing in this Goodwater platform?

"Privation of liberty in holding slaves is, therefore, not to be ranked with things indifferent, but with those which, if not made right by special justificatory circumstances, and the intention of the doer, are morally wrong."

Now, let me ask, what is it, in any case, that makes slaveholding justifiable? I call to your mind the Golden Rule—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Now, who is to be the judge? Who is to decide what are justifiable and what are unjustifiable circumstances? Is it the missionary? Is it the Church? Is it the slaveholder? No! I declare, in the name of the divine Author of the Golden Rule, that neither of these is to be the judge! Who then? Sir, I hold that you must go first and go only *to the slave!* *Ask him* if he be justifiably held in his chains! If he says "Yea!" then your bondage may be innocent; but if he says "Nay," then, though master, missionary, church and all were to cry out, "He is rightfully enslaved," I declare, in the name of the God of justice, that no plea that goes by the name of a justifying circumstance will, for a moment, prevail before the great bar of Him whose judgment is righteous and just! God will accept repentance of the wrong, but not a vindication of it! And if a slave, held in slavery by a man who is a member of Christ's Church, declares that he is deprived of his liberty without his consent, then, sir, the Great Teacher of the Golden Rule, and all the great host of God's elect that look down from heaven to earth, protest against the bondage, and pronounce it sin! Ah! I recall those searching words of Christ—"If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift upon the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift"! Now, when a slaveholder comes to the communion-table with his slave by his side, let him, before he sits down to eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, turn round, and, looking into the face of that dusky man, and remembering the scripture, ask himself, "Has my brother aught against me?" and if there, under the arches of Christ's Church—if there, in the presence of Christ's majesty—the bondman should say that he is willingly held in his bonds, and has naught against his oppressor, that may be a justifiable circumstance. But I declare, by the authority of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, that there is no other justifiable circumstance under the sun! If the slave gives his own consent, I interpose no objection; but if the slave be unwillingly bound, I ask the Church to break the chain!

Mr. Beecher left the impression upon his audience that the laws of the Cherokee nation forbid or prevent emancipation. Now, I have searched to find some such law. I have found none. On the contrary, I have found quite a different law. The legislation of the Cherokees, so far as it affects free negroes and slaves, appears to be milder than that of most of the States. The only restriction is this: if a slave be emancipated, his master shall be responsible for what he does after his emancipation, as before; that is, if he robs a hen-roost or an orchard, his former master shall pay the damages. That is all. There is no prohibition in the way of emancipation. Mr. Beecher cannot say that the slaves in the Cherokee Churches are held in slavery because the strong arm of the law is over them. The arm of the law is powerless to prevent their emancipation. The masters are at liberty to emancipate their slaves, if they will, but they will not! That is the reason why I arraign the Cherokee Mission and the Board that sustains it!

I now come to a passage in the Goodwater platform which my friend omitted to read. Sometimes swift skaters, on coming suddenly to an air-hole in the ice, instinctively, and without stopping to look, leap over it at a bound! So my friend, in the rapidity of his reading, on finding himself coming into a dangerous place, half unconsciously leaped over a significant sentence in the Good-water Platform. Speaking of a missionary's duties, the platform says:

"*As a missionary, he has nothing to do with political questions and agitations!*"

Now, I do not say that my friend omitted these words intentionally; I believed at the time, and believe now, that he did not notice what he was omitting; but you remember, when I called his attention to the slighted sentence, and asked him to read it with the rest, he turned back and read it, and then turned around and exclaimed rather humorously, "Make the most of it!" Yes, sir, I *will* make the most of it; I hope to make a *good deal* of it (laughter). I want to know if it has not been the testimony of this Church, and of its minister, from the beginning until now, that the Church of Christ, and its ministers, *must* have something to do with "political questions and agitations"? Nay, sir, I can once more quote Beecher against Beecher! For only last evening

(Continued on Fourth Page.)

---

* Delivered in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, Jan. 25th, 1860. Mr. Beecher's speech, to which this is a reply, was delivered two days before. The question under discussion will appear from the statement of Mr. Beecher—copied from *The Independent* on the fourth page.

SC 267

71.2009.085.01157

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1860.

THE AMERICAN INQUISITION.

THE Holy Office has been at last erected at Washington. Slavery had had her own way in almost everything of a National description—so much so that the very word National has come to mean merely a willingness to help her have it—but she had lacked the means of getting Northern men, guilty of believing and teaching that every man has an absolute fee simple in his own body and soul, within her clutches. She has offered rewards for the arrest and delivery into her custody of prominent anti-slavery men; but as there was no legal process by which they could be brought before her courts to be tried for offences committed in distant jurisdictions, these inducements failed of answering their end; and the rather because of a well-grounded doubt as to the performance of the promise on the performance of the work, as well as of the danger of condign punishment awaiting the performers, should they ever venture to show themselves in the region whence they carried off their prey. But now the fortunate discovery has been made and the new irresponsible tribunal set up and set a-going. The happy idea of making a Grand Inquest of the United States Senate, and empowering a Committee thereof to compel the attendance of witnesses from all parts of the country, to answer all interrogatories whatsoever, has filled up the gap in the continuity of the works of circumvallation and contravallation which the nation has thrown up for the protection of slavery as the great palladium of American Liberty, and we see little more that she can ask of us. The right of trial by jury has been made a mockery in the Federal Courts, even in the Northern States, by the organized abuses of the Marshals' offices and the judicial recognition of *packing* the pannel, through the exclusion of all who will not consent to take the law from the bar of the Judges Slavery has appointed to guard her interests. And now that this new method has been hit upon for bringing in malignants within her own more effectual gripe, the system of National Lynch Law, which is supreme wherever her interests are concerned, seems to be complete.

Let us see how it may naturally work. Certain persons in the Northern States are believed, in the Southern States, to have been cognizant of John Brown's invasion of Virginia. Being citizens of Northern States, the process of Virginia does not run into them, and they cannot be brought by any method recognized by previously existing laws within her power. The device of trying Stevens before the United States District Court was resorted to for the purpose of compelling Northern men to attend as witnesses, when they could be detained and tried, or lynched if a trial was not to be risked without hindrance or molestation. This scheme was defeated through the drunken obstinacy of the District Attorney, Hunter, we think his name is, who revenged himself for the snubbings he received from Judge and Bar, on the trials at Charlestown, for his incompetency, by refusing to enter a *nol. pros.* to the indictment Still, some way would have been discovered to avoid this difficulty, if the desired purpose could not have been otherwise accomplished. There must be some method of removing incompetent officers in Virginia, which could have been resorted to in case of need. But the devil made a more crafty suggestion in the ear of Senator Mason, which was accepted without a remonstrance even by the Republican Senators, though it was aimed at the lives of their own friends. The danger to which any man accused or suspected of anti-slavery heresy, if brought within reach of Virginia justice, was so apparent that no man valuing his neck would risk it within reach of the noose already prepared for it. Exile would be chosen in the alternative, as it actually was by Dr. S. G. Howe, a man of whose personal bravery not even his enemies have a doubt. But Washington is a kind of neutral ground—at least, a common ground—where men of all kinds of opinions have considered themselves safe. The pitfall was better dug there than in Virginia. The snare was less in the sight of the birds that were to be taken, and there was less danger of the net being set in vain. And so this diabolical craftiness prevailed the more readily.

For, suppose the testimony of some of the witnesses summoned, true or false, should inculpate certain Northern men. These men might be summoned also as witnesses; and whenever beyond the reach of their own Courts and Executives, what would be easier than to deliver them over to the tender mercies of Virginia? There can be no doubt as to what Judge Crawford would decide if the question of their rendition came before him. Nor yet of what the Supreme Court would rule should the point be carried before them for final adjudication. If once within the ten miles square, nothing could save them, if Virginia thirsted for their blood, from being given up, bound hand and foot, into her hands. Should this device work well in this case, there is no reason why a Standing Committee should not be appointed to examine into heresies and schisms which bring disorder into the true Established Church of America, of which Slavery is the god, with power to deliver the heretics or schismatics over to the Secular Arm of the adjoining slave States, to be dealt with as the Canon Laws of that Communion direct. We all know that the modes of dealing with such recusants are summary and effectual whenever they are caught within the pale of its jurisdiction. The difficulty has been to bring them there, and now here is the effectual way provided. These anticipations will doubtless seem to some minds unduly gloomy, and many may doubt whether any such conspiracy could be carried out. Such persons must have watched the history of the past twenty years with very superficial eyes if such be the result of their observation and experience. Such lack of faith in wickedness has helped organize each succeeding encroachment of Slavery into the forms of law, and clothe them with the authority of prescription. Men would not believe that the Annexation of Texas, or the Mexican War, or the Compromises of 1850, or the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, or the Kansas Villanies, were possible until they had crystallized themselves into adamantine facts, and been built firmly into the fabric of our institutions. It should be a living principle of every anti slavery man's faith that everything is possible to Slavery. There is nothing too wicked, too desperate or too extravagant for her to attempt in her struggle to keep her hold upon the nation. Indeed, it is in this very wickedness, desperation and extravagance of hers that there rests any proximate hope for us and for the slaves.

We have said these things over and over again in these columns, for years and years gone by. We believe we may say that there has been none of the usurpations of slavery for the last twenty years that we have not foreseen, and announced their approach. We believe that there is a set purpose on the part of the slaveholders and their Democratic chattels at the North to initiate a Reign of Terror in the Free States, for the purpose of checking and finally crushing Free Speech and the Freedom of the Press. We have said long ago, and we say it again, that there is nothing to prevent the Democratic party now in power from enacting that any speech or writing in the free States of a tendency to excite insurrection in the slave States is a crime punishable with whatever penalties may be thought sufficient for the occasion. Should such a law pass, should one even be enacted requiring that such criminals might be delivered up to any slave State demanding them for trial and punishment, can any one doubt that the Supreme Court would sustain its constitutionality? None but a fool can do so—for they have already made adjudications as preposterous, and announced their readiness to make worse as soon as a case can be brought before them. How far even the Republican leaders in Congress and out of it would stand in the gap if such demands were made, is by no means certain. With their hand almost clutching the sceptre of power, and the key of the treasury almost within their grasp, and in their trembling anxiety to get some shadow of Southern support to rid themselves of the stigma of Sectionalism—their true and chief glory—it is hard to say what concessions they would not make to improve their chances—what sacrifices of political and personal rights they might not be ready to offer on the altar of Political Fortune—especially after the readiness with which they fell into the trap set for their feet by the Virginia Senators—or, rather, for the feet of their best friends and coadjutors.

And this is a Union which these very Republican leaders say must and shall be maintained! A Union into one half of which they themselves cannot venture but at the risk of their lives, where their own constituents have been slain and tortured and robbed, and been happy if they were only expelled from it! A Union, the assembled representatives of which sit glaring at each other, every man armed and ready, if need be, to engage in deadly fray on the floor of the National parliament-house! A Union between civilized men and savages—between natural and necessary enemies—in which the worser part must needs rule and the better go to the wall! Men looking to be Presidents, and Cabinet Ministers, and Foreign Ambassadors, may like such a Union as this and think it worth preserving; but they that pay the price of their greatness at the cost of their own rights and liberties, may be excused for calculating its value. We think that true views as to this value are fast prevailing. But we apprehend that things must get worse before they begin to mend. And we rather think that Destiny, or Providence, intends that the slaveholders shall gain yet another victory, before the free States will have spirit enough kicked into them to maintain what rights they have left and recover those they have lost.

PLYMOUTH CHURCH AND ITS PASTOR.

HENRY WARD BEECHER has generally been regarded, by friends and foes alike, as a thorough-going anti-slavery minister, and the Church of which he is Pastor has been generally supposed to be a thorough-going anti-slavery Church. Both indeed have been accounted by slaveholders and their apologists as quite "fanatical" upon the question of the negro's rights, while many honest friends of the slave have supposed that their reputation in this respect was well deserved. Many of Mr. Beecher's sayings and doings, bearing the stamp of noble impulses and "good intentions," have been calculated to create and foster this impression; but Abolitionists, who have closely watched his course and that of his Church, and understood the relations of both to pro-slavery men and pro-slavery ecclesiastical and missionary institutions, have long been painfully cognizant of shortcomings on their part which tended to nullify their influence against slavery. Their anti-slavery has been exhibited more in *words* than in *deeds*. Often denouncing slavery from the pulpit as a sin, Mr. Beecher has always been, as he is now, in ecclesiastical fellowship with pro-slavery men, and he does not appear to have been even aware that he was required, either on the score of principle or consistency, to keep himself and his Church free from complicity with the champions and apologists of chattelism. Every year since its organization, the Church, with the approbation of its Pastor, has made a contribution to the American Board, never once protesting against its pro-slavery course; and until a recent period it did the same thing for the American Tract Society. But for no organization representing the great Anti-Slavery movement of the country has it ever made a collection! On several occasions it has indeed assisted in purchasing the freedom of slaves—an act so far from being distinctively anti-slavery that it is often performed by many of the bitterest pro-slavery men; and once or twice, perhaps oftener, it has assisted in some educational movement for the benefit of colored people. But the Anti-Slavery cause, as such, has never, like the Bible, the Missionary and the Tract causes, been deemed worthy of its benefactions. During all this time that cause has been struggling against wind and tide, its friends, few and far between, pursuing their object with a steady devotion, in the face of denunciations and revilings which would have disheartened any but those whose daily and hourly trust was in God.

The recent announcement that Plymouth Church was engaged in a discussion of the question, whether it should or should not continue its contributions to the American Board, was received by many friends of freedom with utter surprise and credulity. They could hardly believe that the Church of which Henry Ward Beecher was the Pastor had been thirteen years in arriving at this question; and when they were told in the public prints that Mr. Beecher himself was leading the party in support of the Board, their astonishment was greater still. But the friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society did not share this astonishment, for they had frequently been constrained to lament his want of thoroughness in the application of anti-slavery principles to popular institutions. They were not much surprised even by the current rumors that for eighteen months last past he had scarcely spoken to his congregation against slavery, and that in various ways he was making concessions to the conservative spirit which has so long ruled the American Ministry and Church, and resisted the Anti-Slavery Movement. They had seen, all along, that he must either advance to more consistent ground or be drawn backwards by his ecclesiastical affinities and social environments.

Mr. Beecher's speech in defence of the Board, if we may judge from the reports that we have seen and the testimony of those who heard it, showed clearly enough that he had neither weighed the principles nor the facts involved in the question. He seems, indeed, to have entered into the contest impulsively, without any suspicion that his youthful antagonist, having carefully studied the question, was prepared to meet him at every point with a solid array of fact and argument. As a platform speaker Mr. Beecher has few equals; with a good cause he is invincible; but in this case his young friend and disciple was more than a match for him. We believe that in saying this we express the conviction of nine-tenths of those who witnessed the encounter, and that not a few of those who voted to continue the contributions to the Board did so, not because they thought Mr. Beecher had made out his case, or offered even a plausible reply to Mr. Tilton's argument, but in response to a personal appeal, and because, seeing that he had been vanquished in the discussion, they were unwilling to add to his mortification by beating him in the vote. The whole scope and tendency of Mr. Beecher's preaching for years has been adapted to undermine the confidence of his hearers in the class of men who have managed the American Board, and hence, in appearing as its champion, he put himself in the attitude of a man attempting to arrest the natural current of his own influence. This gave Mr. Tilton an advantage which more than outweighed all disparities of age and position.

Mr. Tilton's speech, though long, is so piquant, forcible and convincing, that we shall make no apology for publishing it entire. It will appear shortly in pamphlet form, and will obtain, we hope, a wide circulation.

Wishing to treat Mr. Beecher with the utmost fairness, we publish (see fourth page) the best sketch of his speech that we have seen, and give place also to an article from *The Independent*, in which he defines his position. Both, it seems to us, indicate a degree of mental confusion that can be accounted for only on the supposition that he has never carefully investigated the matter of which he speaks and writes, but has formed his opinions by a haphazard process, and without any clear perception of their logical relations or consequences. He talks of the American Board as if he were utterly oblivious of its history for the last thirty years—as if he were unconscious that it has exerted its whole influence to "crush out" the anti-slavery movement and to prevent discussion of the subject in its meetings, and as if ignorant of its jesuitism in putting forth *anti-slavery sentiments* only as a means of gaining immunity for *pro-slavery action*. In behalf of the Board, in spite of its shameless disregard of the claims of the slaves and its efforts to smother their cries for relief, his mouth is full of excuses, his heart overflowing with charity; and he is ready to overlook all differences between it and himself and fold it in one long and loving embrace. But toward the Abolitionists, who have stood by the cause of the slave through sorest trials and in opposition to a corrupt State and an apostate Church, his feelings are of quite another sort. Instead of wishing to draw nearer to them and to overlook differences of sentiment in the love of a common cause, he averts his face and vents his feelings in unfriendly criticism.

Mr. Beecher complains of the "doctrinal spirit" among Abolitionists, which he says is "as high, as exclusive and as foolish as ever there was in the religious world"; and he tells us that, as he has "always contended against this fanaticism of doctrine in religious matters," so he "consistently abhors the bigotry of it in great questions of philanthropy." This sounds courageous, but what is the evidence of a "high doctrinal spirit" among Abolitionists? The only points he mentions are, the doctrines first, that slavery is a *malum in se*, and secondly, that the slaves ought to be immediately emancipated. In regard to the first point, he does not seem to be aware that the phrase *malum in se*, as applied to slavery, is the invention not of Abolitionists, but of their hair-splitting clerical opponents, the Stuarts, the Bacons, the Hodges, the Tracys, &c. The Abolitionists were content to affirm, in good Bible English, that slavery is a sin; but the tribe of sophisters above mentioned cried out, "Fanaticism! slavery is *not a malum in se*, therefore not to be denounced as a sin." They paraded this philosophical subtlety to confuse the public mind and offer a ground of excuse for the guiltiest of all slaveholders, viz.: those whose example lends to the system the apparent sanction of Christianity. The Abolitionists replied, that if slavery, "the sum of all villanies," was not a *malum in se*, it was because the phrase was inapplicable to any human act; and if that was a reason for not denouncing slavery as a sin, it was equally good as a reason for not applying the epithet to murder, theft, or any other outrage upon God or man. The anti-slavery constitutions and declarations of sentiment contain no such shibboleth as "*malum in se*"; they simply declare slavery to be a sin against God and a crime against man, and appeal to all who believe this simple truth to unite for its overthrow.

Mr. Beecher also let fly an arrow of sarcasm at the doctrine of "Immediate Emancipation," which, it seems, he regards as an absurdity. It was pitiful to hear from the lips of the Pastor of Plymouth Church the very sneers that, more than thirty years ago, were aimed at the heads of Wilberforce, Brougham and O'Connell by the apologists of West India slavery, but which their logic and eloquence made impotent. There is no moral proposition whatever that cannot be made to look ridiculous by the sort of caricature which Mr. Beecher employed in this case. The opponents of temperance have played off their sarcasms, from time to time, upon the doctrine of "total abstinence," and even the Golden Rule of Christianity has been subjected to the same sort of criticism. It seems incredible that Mr. Beecher should be ignorant of the history and legitimate signification of the doctrine of "Immediate Emancipation," and yet, if he was not so, we see not how to avoid the conclusion that he was exceedingly unfair in what he said upon the subject. If he does not know the power of that doctrine, as first disclosed by Elizabeth Heyrick and afterwards enforced by the eloquence of Wilberforce, Brougham and their associates, and as illustrated by the broken fetters of West India slavery, we must commend him to the study of one of the most instructive chapters of human history. And if he does not understand the meaning of the doctrine, as held by the Abolitionists of this country, he might at least forbear to ridicule it. The old doctrine was that slavery is an evil, to be removed only by a slow and gradual process; modern Abolitionists affirm that it is a sin, to be repented of and abandoned, like other sins, without delay. Is this impossible or absurd? Certainly, says Mr. Beecher, emancipation cannot be immediate, because it takes time to execute the necessary legal papers! On the same principle, he would say that the father who should command his son to go immediately to the post-office for his letters required what was absurd and impossible, since the boy must take *time* to perform the task, and could not even start until he had put on his hat! We commend to Mr. Beecher's attention the following exposition of the doctrine of Immediate Emancipation as held by the Abolitionists. It is from the pen of Garrison, and was written twenty-seven years ago.

What is Meant by Immediate Abolition?

It means, in the first place, that all title of property in the slaves shall instantly cease; because their Creator has never relinquished his claim of ownership, and because none have a right to sell their own bodies or buy those of their own species as cattle. Is there anything terrific in this arrangement?

It means, secondly, that every husband shall have his own wife, and every wife her own husband, both being united in wedlock according to its proper forms, and placed under the protection of law. Is this unreasonable?

It means, thirdly, that parents shall have the control and government of their own children, and that the children shall belong to their parents. What is there sanguinary in this concession?

It means, fourthly, that all trade in human beings shall be regarded as felony, and entitled to the highest punishment. Can this be productive of evil?

It means, fifthly, that the tremendous power which is now vested in every slaveholder to punish his slaves without trial, and to a savage extent, shall be at once taken away. Is this undesirable?

It means, sixthly, that all those laws which now prohibit the instruction of the slaves shall instantly be repealed, and others enacted, providing schools and instruction for their intellectual illumination. Would this prove a calamity?

It means, seventhly, that the planters shall employ their slaves as free laborers, and pay them just wages. Would this recompense infuriate them?

It means, eighthly, that the slaves, instead of being forced to labor for the exclusive benefit of others, by cruel drivers and the application of the lash upon their bodies, shall be encouraged to toil for the mutual profit of themselves and their employers, by the infusion of new motives into their hearts, growing out of their recognition and reward as men. Is this diabolical?

It means, finally, that right shall take the supremacy over wrong, principle over brute force, humanity over cruelty, honesty over theft, purity over lust, honor over baseness, love over hatred, and religion over heathenism. Is this wrong?

This is our meaning of Immediate Abolition.

Where is the individual who is base enough to avow that, on these terms, he is hostile to the liberation of the slaves? who dares to say, in a public and responsible manner—"I am still for giving to the planters unlimited dominion over their slaves, that they may treat them like cattle, deprive them of instruction, mangle, starve and pollute their bodies, rob them of their earnings, and buy and sell them on speculation, as they do at present"? Where is the individual animated with a soul, having parents, or relations, or children, or friends, who would not exclaim, "I am for the rescue of two millions of enslaved countrymen! To talk of the danger or injustice of giving them the protection of wise and equitable laws, and relieving them of their heavy burdens, is an insult to my understanding. I contend for the sacredness of the marriage relations, which are now violated by oppression—for the restoration of stolen property to its rightful owners—for the enforcement of that clause in the Declaration of Independence which asserts 'that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'—and for the instant recognition of every American-born citizen, as a countryman and brother"?

If Mr. Beecher had read this exposition, we think he would have spared his ridicule of the doctrine of Immediate Emancipation. The simple truth is that the Abolitionists have always held this doctrine in a common-sense way, as opposed to the scheme of gradualism, and as the inevitable corollary of the doctrine that slavery is a sin; and we cannot think it becomes any professed anti-slavery man to join the apologists of slavery in ridiculing it.

"There is," says Mr. Beecher, "a disposition to punish men for not holding the high anti-slavery creed up to the very letter of philosophical doctrines." We really do not know of anything to justify this statement. Certainly the charge cannot be established against the friends of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Is Mr. B. sure that he has fairly described the "disposition" he so much deprecates? Is it not for pro-slavery *acts* rather than *opinions* that certain men are "punished"?—by which it is meant, we suppose, that their conduct is exposed and condemned as inconsistent with the principles of morality and Christianity. When men write books to defend slavery, or preach sermons against the Higher Law, *or extend the hand of religious fellowship to those who do such things*, Abolitionists rebuke them, not for heresy of creed, but for *acts* which tend directly to countenance sin and crime. In other words, they measure men and institutions by the morality of the New Testament, not hesitating to carry the torch of truth into the inner sanctuary of the Church.

We agree with Mr. Beecher when he says, "All who are of one mind on this subject [the sinfulness of slavery as defined in "the accursed slave code"] should UNITE and CO-OPERATE to bring every moral and equitable secular influence to bear against this modern Sodom and Gomorrah. . . . . We hold that all men who are willing, *practically* and *earnestly*, to give their influence against slavery, SHOULD BE UNITED." And we take no exception to what he says of freedom of philosophic speculation among those who join their efforts in this grand enterprise of righteousness—nay, we affirm it all with hearty emphasis, only insisting that this liberality shall not be made a covert for acts of complicity with slavery. But how shall "the anti-slavery host" be made "cordially and enthusiastically to coöperate"? Around what nucleus can they be gathered? Of course, the platform on which *all* the opponents of slavery are invited to stand must present no sectarian test, but be free to persons of every shade of religious belief. The platform of the American Anti-Slavery Society fulfils this condition in letter and spirit. During a period of twenty-seven years has that Society lifted up its voice of entreaty in the ear of the nation, soliciting the coöperation of *all* the earnest opponents of slavery. Often has it cordially invited Mr. Beecher to come to its platform, unfettered by any doctrinal or philosophical test, with freedom even to criticise its movements, or to rebuke its managers, if he should see cause for so doing. But he has steadily refused to accept these invitations. Scrupling not to stand in close affinity with apologists for slavery and to work for ecclesiastical and missionary purposes with some of the most unscrupulous enemies of the slave's cause, he has been careful *not* to identify himself with the only class of Abolitionists who invite coöperation on the terms which he professes to approve. The American Board he supports (closing his eyes with facile magnanimity that he may not see the evidence of its heartless opposition to the anti-slavery cause), because it was the first organization that attempted to arouse the American Church to her duty in the work of missions; but for the Society which first lifted up the standard of God's law against the great crime of the age, whose voice first disturbed the guilty slumbers of the American Church over the woes and iniquities of slavery, and which, for its fidelity to truth and freedom, has been reviled by all that is base, brutal and time-serving in the land—for *this* Society Mr. Beecher has no constraining affinity; it has for him no sacred associations to be pleaded in its behalf in Plymouth Church. Toward the sins committed by the American Board *against the slave* he is excusatory, apologetic, charitable, forgiving; but the faults, real or alleged, of the American Anti-Slavery Society, committed in the heats of a terrible conflict with organized wrong, he magnifies into reasons for withholding from it all active sympathy and aid.

But we have written more than we intended, and must stop. In conclusion we once more commend Mr. Tilton's speech to the careful attention of our readers. Long as it is, they will not wish it shorter by even a single line. We also invite attention to the comments of the press upon Mr. Beecher's course, which will be found on the fourth page.

NEW YORK STATE ANNUAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

THE Fourth Annual Anti-Slavery Convention assembled at Albany, in Association Hall, on Tuesday evening, Jan. 31.

This Convention, yearly held in the Capital city, by appointment of the American Anti-Slavery Society (in the absence of a State Society), has grown into an important anniversary occasion. The audiences this year were larger, more thoughtful and intelligent than in any previous year. At different sessions, large delegations of members of the Legislature were in attendance, also many persons from different portions of the State, who at this time in the year have occasion to visit Albany in connection with Legislative affairs. Thus is secured in a large degree, at this point, the audience of the State.

AARON M. POWELL called the Convention to order, and submitted the following organization, which was adopted:

President—MARTHA C. WRIGHT, of Auburn.

Vice-Presidents—JOB WILBUR, and WILBUR DENNIS, of Easton.

Secretaries—ELIZABETH M. POWELL, of Ghent; JOSEPH W. PECKHAM, of Washington Co.

Business Committee—Parker Pillsbury, Lydia Mott, Aaron M. Powell, Marius R. Robinson, Sarah Wilde.

Finance Committee—Susan B. Anthony, Emily Robinson.

A little blind boy, JAMES ASHTON, then sang, with excellent effect,

"Blow ye the trumpet, blow."

The first session was occupied by PARKER PILLSBURY and AARON M. POWELL. Subsequently the Convention was addressed by WENDELL PHILLIPS, MARIUS R. ROBINSON, SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Messrs. PILLSBURY, POWELL, and others. We should be glad to publish a full and complete report of the speeches and proceedings, but shall be unable to do so. The speeches were listened to with a degree of attention indicative of a most lively interest. Of the tone and tenor of the discussions the resolutions which were adopted, which we present herewith, will prove a good index.

1. Resolved, That in the "Irrepressible Conflict" now waging with the power of Despotism in this nation, led forward by Garrison and Greeley, Parker, Seward and Phillips, and sustained by a countless host of determined men and women, too, East, West, North and North-West, we behold a full and glorious assurance that the millennial deliverance of our enslaved millions on Southern plantations draws nigh, and may be even at the doors.

2. Resolved, That the American slave system is the "sum of all villanies"—a compound of all cruelties and crimes; robbery, adultery, piracy, and murder, and whatever else is impure, unholy and accursed.

3. Resolved, That slaveholders, *as such*, have no rights which any human being is bound to respect—and that their so-called States are but organized bands of thieves and robbers, living by plunder and piracy on the avails of unpaid and unpitied toil; and whose victims, Capt. John Brown, Gen. Lafayette, or any Deliverer, believing in "Resistance to Tyrants as obedience to God," may justly and lawfully release from their power."

4. Resolved, That our governmental union with such slaveholders is also a sl nand crime—an atheistic rebellion against every principle of justice, and every law of Nature and of God; which no possible circumstances could have warranted in its formation, and, surely no conceivable conditions justify in its longer continuance.

5. Resolved, That while we rejoice in every indication of advance in public sentiment as opposed to slavery, we cannot forget that, no matter who is President under the present Government and Union, he must still be the *slaveholder and slave-hunter general* of the nation; he must shoot down every black Washington who should strike for his freedom with the sword, and return every sable Kossuth who might take refuge from Southern tyrants on Plymouth Rock or Bunker Hill; must recognize the right of slaveholding robbers and pirates to sit as equal members and makers of the government, and conduct his administration so as to make it the grand engine every way to crush the liberties of our now enslaved millions and their posterity.

6. Resolved, therefore, That it is the solemn and imperative duty of the Senators and Representatives of the non-slaveholding States and Territories to return at once to their respective constituencies and take immediate measures for the formation of a *new Northern Confederacy*—that shall be indeed *free!* the asylum of the oppressed of all nations; uncursed by the presence of slaveholders, unstained by blood of slaves.

7. Resolved, That when Mr. Jefferson declared, "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that the slaves are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two forms of society cannot be perpetuated under the same government";

And Henry Clay, that

"Until universal darkness shall prevail, it will be impossible to *repress* the sympathies and the efforts of freemen in behalf of the unhappy portion of our race who are doomed to bondage";

And Mr. Benton, that

"Slavery is a question of races, involving consequences which go to the extermination of one or the other";

And the Louisville, Ky., *Courier*, that

"It will not be denied that free and slave labor are incompatible; the labor of Kentucky must be wholly the labor of the whites, or wholly the labor of the blacks";

And the Richmond *Enquirer*, that

"The two opposite and conflicting forms of society cannot, among civilized men, co-exist and endure. The one must give way and cease to exist—the other become universal";

And Wm. H. Seward, that

"The collision between the two systems of labor in the United States *is an 'irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces'*";

They did but echo in these declarations the voice and decree of the Eternal God, that between Slavery and Liberty there can be and shall be no concord; but everlasting separation, wide as the difference between heaven and hell.

8. Resolved, That we have read without surprise the Message of Gov. Letcher, of Virginia, to the Legislature of that State, in which he insolently and insultingly recommends that "two most experienced statesmen be appointed to visit the Legislatures of those States which have passed laws to obstruct the execution of the Fugitive Slave law, and insist, *in the name of Virginia*, upon their unconditional repeal.

Resolved, however, That we trust our Legislature will deem such a threat, from such a source, a strong reason for hastening the enactment of a law that will preserve the State of New York effectually and forever from the prowling ravages of the kidnapper and slave-hunter.

9. Resolved, That of all insulting mockeries and blasting burlesques ever known, that which is called the *American Union* is the most monstrous and overwhelming. When the Federal and State authorities are in constant collision; when the mails from the Northern are ruthlessly robbed by the Southern States; when, week after week, month upon month, not enough of union and harmony can be found to organize a branch of Congress by choice of a presiding officer; when members of that body absolutely carry concealed weapons to defend themselves against each other; when brawlings, bullyings, or blackguardings are the burden of their debates; when, in the Southern States, threats of civil war are heard among Governors, and preparations are making for it in their Legislatures should a Northern President be elected; and when the people in those States are outraging in every way, by scourgings, by tarring and featherings, imprisonings, banishments, and sometimes death, the most inoffensive persons, both men and women, white as well as black, on the slightest suspicion that they are friends of the oppressed; to call this condition of things a *Union* is to outrage beyond possible endurance all the common sense of creation. And the only relief in enduring a confederacy at once so devilish and disgraceful is the hope that God, or some other power, will ere long dash it in pieces like a potter's vessel.

10. Resolved, That when the Governor and Legislature of New York, by a recent unanimous voice, invited the Governors and Legislatures of two of the most violent slave States to visit the Capital, as the guests of the State, under circumstances so monstrous and revolting as now exist between the two grand divisions of the country, they perpetrated an act too shamelessly servile to the slave States, and too atrociously insulting to their constituency and the people generally, to be adequately described, or appropriately rebuked, in any language known to mortal tongues.

11. Resolved, That the Church of the slaveholding States that permits and practises the breeding, buying and selling of God's own image like cattle, trampling down marriage, and the whole family relation, forbidding its own Bible and all other books to the enslaved, is most emphatically the synagogue of Satan! And every Church and minister in the North that does not so regard and treat it is false to the Christian name and trust, and therefore unworthy of countenance, fellowship or support.

12. Resolved, That we have seen without astonishment that slaveholders and their accomplices, in defending the accursed slave system, are driven to deny and ignore all the self-evident truths pertaining to Human Rights—that even their gifted and ever-zealous ally, the late Rufus Choate, in their behalf, blasphemed the Declaration of Independence into a sounding tirade of "GLITTERING GENERALITIES!" But when an eminent teacher of religion, like Henry Ward Beecher, for the same unhallowed purpose, boldly inculcates that sin also is but another "glittering generality," that there is no sin in itself; that "nothing is bad, *per se*; and nothing is good, *per se*'"; and that "there are only scholastic subtleties"; and that the great American Board of Missions is a true exponent of Christianity, and not only worthy of support, but is pre-eminently the chosen instrumentality for the world's salvation, notwithstanding that its religion includes slaveholding and slave trading, even to the separation of parents and children; we are constrained to believe, from such revelations, that the age of wonders has not ceased—and that slavery has done its most fearful, fatal work on the Northern Pulpit—though we cannot but rejoice that the infidelity of Beecher is now revealed; and that not even his brilliant eloquence and shining talents can longer mislead the people, perverting and poisoning the public conscience and character.

WENDELL PHILLIPS was never more eloquent, searching, aggressive and thoroughly uncompromising in his utterances. He is emphatically God's FREEMAN, and inspired apostle, preaching, with unexampled directness, eloquence and force, the righteous gospel of deliverance to the captive, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound.

PARKER PILLSBURY spoke with an eloquence and a strength peculiar to himself. His hearers were held by his arguments and irresistible illustrations, as within the hollow of his hand. Having reviewed the present aspects of the Anti-Slavery cause, the martyrdom of the heroes of Harper's Ferry, and spoken of CHARLES O'CONOR in the North, and the Reign of Terror in the South, he held up to view, with telling effect, the reprehensible conduct of Gov. Morgan, and the Legislature, for inviting here, as guests of New York, the man-stealing, woman-whipping Governors, and Legislatures, of Tennessee and Kentucky. He fitly characterized the invitation, in times like these, and under such circumstances, when Northern citizens were being put to death, daily persecuted in or exiled from the South, for real or supposed interest in the cause of human liberty, as an insult to the people of the Empire State, and as atrocious and unpardonable servility to the Slave Power.

MARIUS R. ROBINSON, who is a good speaker, and well calculated to command the confidence and esteem of his hearers, spoke ably and eloquently in advocacy of the doctrine of "No Union with Slaveholders," of the responsibility now resting upon the North for the existence and perpetuity of slavery, and of the desirableness of a Northern Confederacy, consecrated to freedom.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY made stirring and effective appeals to the people, urging the need and importance of practical coöperation in the dissemination of anti-slavery documents and newspapers, and by liberal contributions of money, to aid in the right education of public sentiment.

The Convention adjourned on Thursday afternoon, Feb. 2d, and in the evening Mr. PHILLIPS gave his justly celebrated lecture—"Toussaint L'Ouverture," in the same Hall, to a very large audience, under the auspices of the Young Men's Association.

The circumstances under which the lecture was given seemed to increase the interest. The large Congregational Church (Dr. Palmer's) has been used for the Association lectures this season, the Hall proving inadequate for their accommodation, and had been regularly engaged by the Association for Mr. Phillips's lecture, but at a late hour the engagement was broken by a portion of the Trustees of the Church. The only recourse was to go to the Hall, which was completely filled, and hundreds were disappointed and unable to gain admission. The result of this action was much righteous indignation, and wholesome agitation. The lecture was listened to with the deepest interest, and most effectually "conquered the prejudices" of all who heard it.

Our friends in Albany, the MOTTS, JONESES and others, are highly gratified with the character and success of this last Anniversary occasion, and to them we would acknowledge, in behalf of our cause, and its advocates, great indebtedness for liberal and generous hospitality, and most efficient coöperation.

P.

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 7, 1860.

SINCE I wrote you last the House has escaped from its dead-lock, and the Republicans have triumphed over their political enemies. That the election of Pennington is a defeat of the pro-slavery Democracy you would believe if in Congress for a day. They feel it to be a defeat, and a decided one, and on the other hand the Republicans feel it to be a triumph. Unquestionably the election of John Sherman would have been a more complete victory over the enemy, but the dropping of Sherman and the taking up of Pennington did not indicate any lowering of the Republican standard. If the Republicans had possessed a clear majority in the House, and their first act had been to take up a doubtful candidate, their action might fairly have been taken as an index of their sentiments. But such was not the case. Lacking eight votes of a majority of the House, they put up a distinctive Republican and stuck to him for eight long weeks, and then only gave him up, at the earnest request of Mr. Sherman himself, to prevent the triumph of the pro-slavery party. Mr. Sherman could not get a majority vote—and Mr. Pennington could. Mr. P. had, from the first, and without change, voted for Sherman, the Republican candidate, and his election, to all intents and purposes, is as great a defeat of the slaveholders as the election of any other Republican member.

To estimate the triumph over the pro-slavery party you must take into account the wild panic which has swept over the country, especially the slave States, and such States as Pennsylvania, and portions of New York, on the slavery question. The great struggle in the House was over the six or eight votes standing between the Pro-Slavery party and the Republican party. Who should get these votes? A great noise was made, and a tremendous pressure brought to bear upon these outstanding members. It is certainly no mean victory, under such circumstances, for the party that has been so abused by the pro-slavery members, and which, whatever may be its shortcomings in other respects, is opposed to the schemes of the slaveholders for extending slavery into new territory. It shows that the cause of anti-slavery goes onward—however slowly. One of the shrewdest, ablest—in short, the leading—Republican in Congress says: "Notwithstanding the panic, the anti-slavery cause goes *onward*, but it will take ten years *at least* to elect a decent anti-slavery President." This, I fear, is true—*fear* because I had hoped that such a man as Seward might be made President a year hence. The signs, as I read them, from this point of view, are all against his nomination. The drift of the tide is towards *moderate* action. Forney is made Clerk—Hoffman Sergeant-at-Arms. Both are bitter enemies of the slavery-propagandists, or, at least, of this Administration, but their election shows the *disposition* of a majority of the Republicans in the House. The way in which the minor offices are filled also indicates that the day has not arrived when men who hold strong anti-slavery sentiments can get office, even under a Republican Administration. But this matters little, except as a sign of the times, for any anti-slavery man who is degraded enough to seek office, unless it be that of a representative of his sentiments, deserves defeat. I know of a case, however, in this city, where an old citizen of Washington, who has done a great amount of anti-slavery and Republican work, and that, too, without pay, and who now is in circumstances where he might be benefited by an office, so far has been coolly shoved aside, though his claims are undeniable. I may be mistaken, but I fully believe that he fails of success *simply* because he is genuinely anti-slavery. The experience, however, may be good for him. Whoever depends upon parties will fall to the ground. The anti-slavery man who is more ambitious than anti-slavery will find that he must eventually choose between his ambition and anti-slavery. For one, I could wish that some of the Republican candidates for the Presidency cared less for the so-called highest honors of the party. What position can be higher or nobler than that of Seward in the Senate-hall? To be President is nothing in comparison with the position of a great leader in the Senate; and though it would be a magnificent triumph for Freedom to elect Seward President, yet it would cost too much if it would take Mr. Seward forever from the Senate.

Mr. Douglas gains every day with the Southern politicians. To show his dirtiness of spirit, I have but to state that he used every particle of his influence *to defeat* his old friend and defender, Col. Forney, for Clerk. He did this *to please the slave-traders*. That was the whole of it. Now, does anybody believe that, with this fact before Forney's eyes—that Douglas tried to defeat his election to the Clerkship of the House—he will turn round and help Douglas to the White House? The thing is scarcely possible. It isn't in human nature to do it, and Forney has about as much grit as any man can have who has belonged to the Democratic party.

President Buchanan has done one good act. He has pardoned Manuel Mason out of jail and remitted his fine. You will remember the case. He was fined $200 for sheltering his own little boy, a slave. Now that Buchanan is going out of office, he has done this just deed. I am told that Senator Brown of Mississippi, when the facts of the case were brought to his knowledge, declared that I was the most infamous outrage he ever heard of. Yet this was done in Washington, where we are told by every body that slavery is a "mild institution."

The argument of Dr. Boyd for a new trial has not yet been finished before Judge Crawford, but the impression seems to be that a new trial will be granted. Every species of cruelty is possible, however, under the Slave Code.

Mr. Giddings and Mr. Plumb, of Ohio, have been before the Mason Committee, and have sworn to no new facts. The same is true of Dr. Howe's testimony. No Republican or Abolitionist has been implicated in the Brown foray, nor will any future testimony implicate such parties. Mr. Mason is already dreadfully disappointed, and already regrets, I presume, the calling of the Committee. So long as the charges against the Republicans were general, so long they made no reply. But the result of Mr. Mason's labors will be to prove the Democratic editors throughout the country to be infamous liars.

AVON.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO. CCLXIII.

THE ARGUMENT.—The Correspondent on the Subscription Festival—He again acknowledgeth his errors—And quoteth Mother Goose—His views of its success—He giveth some details of the method—He doth justice to the Chairman—Also to Mr. Garrison—He accounteth for his good reception—And describeth the heathenish darkness of Mr. Gangooly's notions of slavery—Also the kindness of Chairman and Meeting towards Mr. Phillips—He telleth of the decorations; but especially of the photographs of Brackett's bust of John Brown—Also apposite anecdotes thereunto appertaining—He briefly refers to the Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society—And condemneth the neglect of good advice—Mrs. Follen's death and funeral, &c. &c. &c.

BOSTON, Feb. 6, 1860.

THE Second Anti-Slavery Subscription Festival was indeed a great success, as you intimated in your last paper, and as I suppose the authentic Report of the same will inform all your readers in this present issue. As I do not choose to enter myself in a match at description with the writer of that Report, I shall not attempt any extended account of it. I will only say that the sublime audacity of the conception of inviting people to come and give money to the sect everywhere spoken against was fully justified by the result. I remember I told you last year that I had no faith whatever in the success of the new plan which was to supersede the Bazaar, before it was tried. It seemed to me very much like the invitation extended to the ducklings in Mother Goose,

"Dilly, dilly, ducklings, come and be killed!"

an appeal, I thought, much more easy to be made than likely to be responded to affirmatively. The Bazaar seemed to hold out a kind of bait to the ducklings which might excuse their compliance in their own eyes, which, in my blindness, I deemed the bare announcement of their doom was unlikely to secure. But as I acknowledged my error last year, so I am happy to say that its magnitude has been demonstrated this year over again. The ducklings showed a cheerful readiness to come and meet their fate that was in the highest degree creditable to them and to the voice of the charmer that solicited their approach. They seemed to have a due sense of the dignity of the cause for which they *bled*.

The precise result I cannot tell, as I do not know; but this is of the less consequence, as your reader will have it stated accurately elsewhere in your paper. It is enough to say that it was more, on this side the Atlantic, at least, than it was last year. And it would doubtless have been much more had it not been for the large sums so lately called for in aid of the Harper's Ferry prisoners, for their defence and their families, most of which came from purses which would have naturally overflowed into this fisc. But as the object to which the results of the Festival were to be applied was the agitation of the subject of slavery, they could not have been put to better use than to keep astir that which John Brown had set on foot. The general arrangements of the evening were substantially the same as they were last year. The ladies who extended the invitation presided each at her own separate tea-table and did its honors with all grace and hospitality. At the same time they were as ready to receive as to give—an inversion of the gospel precept which was no contradiction of it in this case—and subscription-books, gayly adorned with ribbons, lay invitingly open alongside of the tea-equipage, ready to record the free-will offerings as they were made. A hollow square of tables was arranged in the centre of the Hall, with the intention of making that the nucleus of the meeting when the speaking should set in. But the attendance was so great that this idea had to be given up, and the presiding and speaking done from the platform, as they were last year.

The eminent personage, to whose services in the same capacity a year ago I justly attributed so large a share of the pecuniary success of that occasion, again occupied the chair with undiminished dignity and efficiency. Mr. Garrison was the first spirit summoned from the vasty deep of the floor to the conspicuity of the platform. He was received with a favor a little extraordinary when we consider the unfavorable opinion held of him by so many of Our First Men, in the State and out of it. It may be, however, that a man who has contracted a chronic habit of holding a pistol at Governor Banks's head, as General Cushing assures us he has, and compelling him to steer the ship of State in whatever direction he pleases, may naturally strike such terror into any assembly he enters as to extort, at least, the external demonstrations of respect. I must do this gentleman the justice to say that, often as he speaks on the one subject of slavery, he never repeats himself, but always puts it in a new and striking light. A proof, at once, of the many-sidedness, as the Teutons say, of the subject and the speaker. This speech was no exception to the general rule. Mr. Gangooly, the converted Brahmin, was the next speaker, and he excited a very general interest by his appearance and his remarks. He said, among other things, that though he knew slavery existed in this country before he came to it, he had always supposed that it was exercised by the aboriginal pagan barbarians of the land. It was not until his mind had been enlarged by American travel that he learned that the barbarians were special Christians and patent Democrats! The Chairman considerately asked the indulgence of the audience for the next speaker, Mr. Wendell Phillips. I am happy to say the appeal was most kindly responded to, and, considering his inexperience and unaccustomedness to public speaking, he really did extremely well. This attempt concluded the public services of the evening, but it was protracted, socially and conversationally, to a later hour, when the assembly reluctantly broke up "in measureless content."

I might have mentioned that the Music Hall was very fitly decorated for the occasion, and that over the platform stood the busts of Messrs. Garrison, Phillips, Emerson and Sumner, and Dr. Channing. But the decorations in this kind which attracted the most interest that evening were the splendid photographs of Brackett's magnificent bust of John Brown. I have not yet seen the bust itself; but it must be, as I am well assured it is, a very remarkable work of art. The head looks like that of an ancient bard or philosopher, or rather like one of the best-looking of the Hebrew prophets. Moses himself, seen in vision by Michael Angelo, could scarce surpass in majesty of countenance the man who deemed himself (and, perhaps, justly) his appointed successor. It is no wonder that an artist of bunker proclivities—for, paradoxical as it sounds, there may be such a combination—should have exclaimed on looking at it, "What a shame that the old *cuss* should make us all look so mean alongside of him!" A more willing, but not less gratifying, tribute to the artist's success was paid by an anti-slavery lady, who shall be nameless. But, on second thought, I don't see why she should be nameless, inasmuch as she must be hardened by this time to seeing her good things in print. It was Mrs. Lydia Maria Child, then, who was looking at the clay model and said to Mr. Brackett,

"You must make haste and put this into marble, before anything happens to you."

"You need not fear," replied he; "I shall not die before I have put that bust into marble."

"And you will certainly never die *after you have!*" said she.

Was ever compliment turned more gracefully? Copies of the bust will soon be offered for sale, and the photographs are already to be had at the low price of two dollars each. I trust that the sale will be as remunerative as the artist deserves, and then he will have no reason to complain.

It would be hard to add anything to the account you have given, or will give, of the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, inasmuch as you will give, if you have not already, the whole of it. And there was nothing in particular to tell of that will not be contained in the official report. The day sessions were held in the Melonaon, a Lesser Temple, and the evening ones in the large hall up stairs. The attendance was always better than good. In the evening the large hall was all but crowded with listeners ready to hear anything that could be said. Sir Charles Fox, the architect of the Crystal Palace, when he was here, two or three years ago, warned his friends against the Tremont Temple, prophesying that it would one day come down by its own weight, as the Pemberton Mill did, the other day. I trust it will not select for its downfall the time of one of our meetings, and that it will at whatever time give reasonable notice of its intention to quit. The only mistake about the meeting lay in neglecting to pre-arrange the first session, according to a suggestion of the distinguished Chairman of the Festival, which has been followed most successfully for several years. He advised making the first morning session of all our meetings one for set speeches from our best speakers, duly advertised beforehand. This has always secured a full audience to begin with and launched the meeting well. There is no difficulty about sailing it after it is once afloat. This year, this precaution had been neglected, and there were those formidable pauses and gaps now and then which are unavoidable at a first session, where no specific preparation has been made against them. But a little breeze fortunately sprung up which set the sails flapping, and Mr. Phillips, by a vigorous turn of the rudder, got the craft handsomely under way. After that, all went well.

I have purposely avoided alluding to the great sorrow which cast its shadow over those anti-slavery days and nights. The dread of its coming was upon that first evening and dashed its cheerfulness; but there was then life, and with it hope and faith that such a life was not to be so soon quenched in darkness. On the first day of the meeting the gathering fears grew stronger, and on the second we knew that their sad prophecies had come to pass. It will mark that Anniversary in the long succession of such with a monumental remembrance. I knew Mrs. Follen as long as I had known any one on earth. Her idea is mingled with my very earliest recollections. I knew her so long and so well that I feel myself incompetent to write her character as I think it should be done. *I* could add nothing to what your last paper contained; but there survive who can add much to it, and who will. She was buried the Sunday after, from her home at Brookline. It was a most exquisite winter's day—warm, clear, bright, sparkling—no unfit emblem of the beautiful winter of her life. There were none present besides her immediate family and nearest personal friends—for to this last class her anti-slavery friends justly belonged. It was such a company as she would have wished to take part in her obsequies, had she given her own directions in the matter. The Rev. James Freeman Clarke performed the funeral services well, and did not fail to give prominence to her anti-slavery character and services. She was buried at Mount Auburn, in a grave, having often expressed a horror of tomb-burial—a practice which I also esteem as nothing less than detestable and disgusting. There are few spots in that "Garden of Graves" that will excite a tenderer interest in a greater number of hearts than the one where her dust is laid.

D. Y.

Our European Correspondence.

LETTERS FROM HARRIET MARTINEAU.—XXIII.

JANUARY 16, 1860.

To the Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

GREAT things have happened since I wrote last, on our side the water. In some sense, we may say that great things have occurred—or rather that important suggestions have been made—in your country. While it is undeniable that the President's message is small and low in spirit and tone, it is exceedingly significant in such a crisis; and the failure to organize the House of Representatives is, I suppose, as good a stroke of business as an organized House could have done in the time.

We suppose the message to have been prepared for European reading; but we consider it no great compliment from our old acquaintance, who ought to know something of England and Paris, that he presents us with such misrepresentations of the state of affairs, expecting us to accept his point of view, and his descriptions. We know and care far too little, generally speaking, of the critical circumstances of your country; but we *are* aware that Mr. Buchanan's rebukes about imperilling the Union, and all the rest of it, ought to be addressed to the "chivalry," and not to the populous North, which has all the world on its side. As for the rest, Mr. Buchanan himself never framed a message which showed so clearly as this one that he has not a spark of feeling about the moral right and wrong of the slave trade, and of other great topics of which he treats, but thinks it duly dignified, proper and moral to use the coarsest conventional expediency as the key by which to interpret all constitutional and political questions. The production is as choky as sawdust, and it gives an idea of a dried-up old man-of-the-world, who has not even much of his world-wisdom left. The astonishing thing about the message is that it could have been presented at such a time, and under such circumstances.

Events seem to show that there is great utility, as well as something more interesting, in the silence of the Republican Representatives, while the suspense lasts. Nothing could serve their cause so well as letting the "chivalry" talk, without provocation and without opposition, so as to show what they have to say, and what their taste is as to the manner of saying it. In our opinion, there is no need of any answer. They may easily be judged by their own speeches, without any risk of injustice. I think I observed upon a thorough-going pro-slavery "leader" in the London *Times*, about a fortnight ago. There was a second, which was promptly answered by *The Daily News*. The speeches of Southern gentry seem to have been rather too much since then for even *The Times*; for it has now been turning its protégés into ridicule. It is ashamed of them, probably, and now pretends to show impartiality by laughing at them. Gov. Wise's proposal to go to war with us as well as with you—with England as well as New England—because our laws afford protection to residents of all complexions in Canada, is, to be sure, rather beyond the pale of English patronage. So *The Times* proclaims the folly of Gov. Wise, quotes his desire for a pirate vessel wherewith to kidnap Frederick Douglass on the Newfoundland Banks, and then takes occasion to speak of the action of the North as inspired by "generous impulses." It seizes the weak point in treating these impulses as "fitful," and assuming that the North will succumb to the South, as hitherto. You will not consider this unjust in regard to your free States generally. You will at once see how inevitable it is for observers to remark that you are a self-governing people, and can therefore be well governed, and live under good laws, whenever you please; and that if you cannot manage this for yourselves, nobody can help you. You will easily conceive also what the curiosity and anxiety are to see what the North *will* do under the stimulus of recent events. If I repeat this, it is because I should be remiss in not reporting it.

Some recent reforms of the highest importance which have been made here suggest the question why the abuses of official patronage, of which you all complain, are not taken in hand and cured. Wherever we turn, we meet with the same complaint. Your travellers in Greece, Hungary, Sweden and elsewhere advert to the corruption at home in commenting on the politics of other countries. Mr. Buchanan's opinion appeared in his Pittsburg letter; and the ordinary Washington correspondence frequently refers to it as an unquestioned fact. Have you been attending to the introduction here of a new and pure system of appointments to the public service—the civil and military services, India, and, in part, the navy? How is it that you have allowed us to get before you in the adoption of the pure republican principle of the career open to merit? If you believe that you have "a devouring political gangrene" in your State—as we once had in our old Poor law—how is it that it is not extirpated? Our "gangrene" was much more difficult to deal with—deeper seated, and more vitally encroaching; yet we have got rid of it. Our poor are now more secure than ever of a maintenance by law, while they have ceased to eat out the heart of our capital and our industry. It required much zeal, industry, courage and fortitude to reform the institution; but it is done, and we are saved. The easier work of reforming the system of appointments to the public service has of late advanced rapidly and favorably; and we may now consider the achievement safe.

After a long course of ineffectual complaints of the monopoly of state offices by the aristocracy and their protégés, the late Russian war brought the matter to an issue. The imperfect condition of the army and navy, and all the services subordinate to them occasioned an inquiry what the aristocracy had been about. Of gross corruption in those departments we have little or nothing; and the complaints were not of bribery or peculation, but of inefficiency, and unscrupulous acquiescence in it. People who suppose all good things to be created especially for them are not those who ever propose to improve upon the actual state of affairs. It was not the corruption of the aristocracy, but their egotism, their conceit, their ignorance and their presumption, that we complained of. Events humbled them; experience convicted them; the disclosures of that crisis were made the basis of a new system; and now the career is open to merit. Any youth of any rank whatever may offer himself for the public service with an equal chance with all others. A testing examination at the outset proves his quality of every sort. The unqualified are refused; the qualified are admitted, without respect of persons; and the same process has to be gone through at different stages of the preparatory education, so that the best qualified are admitted first, and others as they become qualified; so that, when the incapables who still survive have passed away, the work of the empire will be done as it was never done before, except in the India Company's service. While we hear of wholesale charges with every new President, so that thousands of offices are given to new men who cannot have been properly tested as to their fitness, we are henceforth to see our public service filled up without regard to political party, by men who have gone through a long and careful training, and have been tested by successive examinations, conducted by impartial authorities of the highest character. Is not our method more republican than yours? And would not some of the most flagrant of your political evils be extinguished by a pure and well-organized system of appointments? And what can hinder this reform, from the moment when it is desired?

We have the same kind of precautionary method in partial use now in a department in which you need reform as urgently as in any—the merchant service. Since I wrote last, some more dreadful facts have been disclosed of the life that is led on board some American merchant-vessels. To say the truth, we find such stories too much for us. We cannot endure such savagery; and some fearful demonstration will take place some day if something is not done to put a stop to the cruelties by which colored seamen especially, but also whites, are tortured to death by officers who seem to be more fiends than men. Why do not your several States establish a testing process for the officers of their mercantile marine, to ascertain a man's fitness in regard to knowledge, experience, moral character, temper and manners, before the lives and comfort of other men are committed to his power? The relations between the merchants and the government seem to be sufficiently alike in the two countries to render the same method available in both. Whether by this method or by some other, there must be reform on board American merchant-ships, or mischief will come of it. The existing state of that service is a sore injury to its respectable members, and an outrage upon human feelings which European nations will resent on their own part, as well as on behalf of the victims of brutal commanders and their underlings.

The changes I referred to in the first line of my letter are quite as important as I ever anticipated, and exceedingly striking in their immediate effects. The long suspense which the free Italian States bore so well, and which the world felt to be so unjust to them, in their raw and unsettled condition, is at an end. The Emperor of the French has made his decision (whether it will last is another question). He has come over to the liberal side; and before I write to you again, the *de facto* governments in the emancipated Italian States may have been recognized by England and France, and some others of the European powers. We are told that, in perplexity which could not any longer be put up with, the Emperor consulted our government; saw that our policy was the right one, and indeed the only defensible one; parted with Walewski (the great obstacle to Italian liberty), and committed himself to a liberal policy abroad, the very opposite to his rule at home. Inquiry being made of Austria, we are informed, she replied that she was neither able nor willing to renew the conflict in Italy. This was decisive. It is true, Austrian and other German soldiers are flocking to the Pope's standard; but openly, Austria will not move, and the Pope and the banished Princes have only to submit. You have seen the Emperor's letter to the Pope; a document which will improve his position in history hereafter; and you will feel, as we do, a thrill of interest in the thought that we are witnessing the downfall of the Papacy as an European power. You must be somewhat puzzled at the proceedings of the Catholics in this kingdom. The truth is, the body is split into at least three sections in this country alone. The ignorant Papist element in Ireland, managed by creatures of the Pope and his council, are reckless enough to declare the Holy See bound up with the possession of the States of the Church. They talk of fighting, and abuse England, as if we were at war with the Pope. It is declared that Cardinal Wiseman has promised his Holiness an Irish brigade. I need not explain that such a promise is a mere bravado. It would be no more absurd if other subjects of the British government promised Garibaldi a brigade against the Pope. The incident is worth quoting merely as an illustration of the quality of the speakers who have been talking "fast and furious" in Ireland. Another section addresses the government with a petition that, in our foreign policy, we may not employ our influence against the Pope, but allow him opportunity to institute reforms, and give a lay government to his subjects in the Romagna. These are the measures which the Pope refused when suggested, some time since, by the French Emperor. A third section of Catholics, consisting of the most enlightened, and not the least devout and devoted of the body, are publicly and privately protesting against mixing up the temporal and spiritual powers of the papacy, and declaring their belief that the true way to preserve the Holy See is to consider its spiritual function all in all.

This is a very remarkable state of affairs. I need say nothing of the Pope's ability to meet the crisis. You will have seen how he can bemoan himself, and scold his French protector. For the present, we are on good terms with France. As a consequence of our deliberate policy of last spring, England is at the head of the councils of Europe.

H. M.

THE TWENTY-SIXTH

National Anti-Slavery Subscription-Anniversary.

1860.

THIS annual reception of the friends of freedom, by the Anti-Slavery families in and around Boston, was never before so strengthening and effectual in the service of the Cause.

At a moment of sharp revolutionary crisis, before the intellect has had opportunity to change the course, or sentiments and principles have had time to bring forth fruit from the hearts they have won while effectually repelling the hearts they could not save—at such an hour an increase in funds and numbers is a sure criterion of success. We salute our absent associates, "Saints that be in Rome," and elsewhere the world over, with our congratulations; for this evidence of its progress our Cause has just had; this guarantee of its rapid advance, during the coming season, its servants have just received. We welcomed to its duties and its joys a *far* larger number of persons than in any former year. They came to give and not to receive; and their gifts, in the aggregate, including the European subscriptions, amount on this occasion to rising **$6,000.**

We entreat every one of these treasured names, in both hemispheres, to receive the renewed assurance of our gratitude, for the sake of that great sacred Cause in which all futurity is bound up; and while receiving the smallest offering, we have gratefully remembered how much easier it may often be for an American to risk his life for a great object than to make to it the sacrifice of his means of living.

We see in these gifts, not in every instance, the measure of the givers' devotedness, but the assurance of their sympathy, and the token of their desire that slavery should exist no longer. For none of these names were wrung from their reluctant owners, like so many of those that were lately dragged to Faneuil Hall, in the name of Union, by a few selfish advocates of the barbarous custom that dissolves every human tie. They have all offered willingly; some all that they have, even their living; some the little emblematical gift, which tells that they have before devoted all, as those who have learned what life is for, and are using it accordingly.

Our thanks are unitedly tendered to all who so kindly aided our preparations to convert the Music Hall into a saloon of reception for the occasion, and helped us to decorate it in a manner befitting the object, with the busts and pictures that consecrate our homes, and make the friends of freedom of both races, both hemispheres, and North and South alike, a kindred band.

A file of letters of great interest, from all parts of the world, remain to be answered. They have all been profitable to us, whether by suggestion, approbation, reproof or sympathetic encouragement, and the respected writers shall receive in due season the fuller private expression of our gratitude. Of these most gratifying letters, three demand a special reference, as illustrative, in contradiction of *The Times* newspaper, of the temper of Great Britain towards our enterprise. One from a leading mind in London, thoroughly conversant with the popular mind through the realm, reads thus: "The name of John Brown is known and revered throughout England, even to the kitchens and cottages. Our servants read all that has appeared about him with an avidity, and sympathy, and admiration of his character which I could not describe, while the cheap publications have borne the facts of the affair into the humblest peasants' cottages in all parts of the kingdom."

The second letter, from one whose rank qualifies for observation from the highest social and political point of view, says: "As to the *feeling* in England, you cannot doubt it is *entirely* with you."

The third letter is from a friend of leading influence in Ireland, and whose study of twenty years it has been to understand the Anti-Slavery movement in the United States, that he might be qualified for that coöperation with it which every good and great mind throughout the world desires. He warmly approves of the stringent principles and the peaceful measures of the beneficent undertaking which he has observed and aided so long, and calls upon every Irishman in America to be faithful to it, in the name of his country and his religion. This letter will appear hereafter.

All our English correspondence shows that *The Daily News* and *The Morning Advertiser* are the organs of English public sentiment—not *The Times*.

Many friends, whom we especially remember, we regretted to have been unable especially to invite, for want of their respective addresses; and we learn with disappointment that a package of notes sent to friends in the State of New York, was lost on the way. This we mention that they may know we did not fail to remember them.

The conversations during the evening were of surpassing interest, covering the whole ground of the Cause in all its history, purposes, collateral bearings and tendencies. The occasion was too nearly a private one to permit us to reproduce them, but our friends who make THE NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD their organ of communication will not fail hereafter to treat appropriately in its columns of all the great themes then suggested. We emphatically commend that paper, with *The Liberator*, to all who wish to understand their own time as a whole, and to cooperate for the best employment of it.

The anxious tone in which we are continually asked by persons not their own men, but under the dominion of some interest vested in slavery, "What do you do with this money?" proves to us that, as business people, they are fully aware of the vast amount of moral, ecclesiastical, political and social influence for Abolition that lies in a few thousand dollars a year, well expended.

We shall not enter into a mere partisan canvass—that surface work so exhausting to free soil—that most delusive form of "gradualism"—that sytematic adjournment of our action. We shall neither organize anti-slavery churches nor found colored schools and hospitals, nor redeem single slaves, nor run them off in bodies. These things—in our early time the refuges of hostile hypocrisy, or the excuses of compassion unequal to the highest occasion—will more and more spring up hereafter in the Anti-Slavery future as the natural harvest of our tillage. We have, as the advance of a national movement, a mightier work to do. We have, as heretofore, to press, beam-deep, this plough that must run straight through the field of the world, in conformity with its real great interests over the ruins of its fictitious little ones—our own among the first; and we are able to assure those trembling on the brink of anticipated sacrifice that neither the first nor any other step in this direction costs, in comparison with the shameful cost of *not* taking it.

Wherever we find a neighborhood in ignorance, a church filled with obdurate hearts, ministers trembling in the presence of the pew-trade, merchants bowing down respectfully to the slave trade, Republicans standing by slave-hunting, gentlemen and ladies, unaware of their responsibilities, as such, to the great cause of Liberty, we send to them the living voice and the printed page that are sure to be reproduced in Congresses and Conventions in due season. We shall take the initiative in the elevation of the public mind, knowing that otherwise every work or deed will fall fruitless upon it.

There were noble works of Literature wrought for our Cause before our beloved HARRIET BEECHER STOWE; there was a saint and a hero martyred for it before our venerated friend JOHN BROWN. But it is ever only a man silently put to death and a book unread, till at least one generation has spent itself in the toil of preparing the public conscience. Next year, the wheels of the American Congress, which have never moved but to bear down the principles of Liberty and torture the enslaved and their advocates, will be held back longer than eight weeks from their customary crushing. The choice will hereafter be between the formal dissolution of a Union which has long had no existence but for evil, or the inauguration, by constitutional amendment of true union, which only can become practicable when the dissolvent is cast out.

We now see our heart's desire, touching slavery, in process of fulfilment; and we affectionately remind all who are not

"Unworthy of the Grand Adversity"

that the greater the number that apply their strength at the precise point of public instruction and influence, where ours is expended, for the peaceful, immediate, unconditional abolition of slavery itself, the sooner will it be trodden out by the majestic advance of the world.

If ever our country become a battle-field, and the slaveholders and non-slaveholders two camps (which, in this dawning of the twentieth century, we do not apprehend, being guaranteed against it by the worst and the best traits of our people's character), it will be because men of leading positions and sufficient cultivation are too ignobly slow of heart to act seasonably in this all-comprehending Cause. It is to kindle among them, and all those they influence, the sacred fire of Truth, and Love, and Liberty, that we spend and are spent—not without success.

The following lines, sung by a volunteer choir of friends, were written for the occasion by Mrs. LYDIA MARIA CHILD:

THE HERO'S HEART.

"When he went from the jail to the gallows, he stooped to kiss a colored child that stood near."

A winter sunshine, still and bright,
The Blue Hills bathed with golden light,
And earth was smiling to the sky,
When calmly he went forth to die.

Infernal passions festered there,
Where peaceful Nature looked so fair;
And fiercely, in the morning sun,
Flashed glittering bayonet and gun.

The old man met no friendly eye,
When last he looked on earth and sky;
But one small child, with timid air,
Was gazing on his silver hair.

As that dark brow to his up-turned,
The tender heart within him yearned;
And, fondly, stooping o'er her face,
He kissed her for her injured race.

The little one, she knew not why
That kind old man went forth to die;
Nor why, 'mid all that pomp and stir,
He stooped to give a kiss to her.

But Jesus smiled that sight to see,
And said, "He did it unto me!"
The golden harps then sweetly rung,
And this the song the angels sung:

"Who loves the poor, doth love the Lord!
Earth cannot dim thy bright reward;
We hover o'er you gallows high,
And wait to bear thee to the sky."

The friends to whom we owed that music obliged us in no ordinary degree, for they fulfilled the last request of one whose name—the most tenderly beloved and widely honored of all—will appear with ours, in this behalf, no more.

This brief record of a festival saddened by her death is not the place to praise or mourn ELIZA LEE FOLLEN; but never has one so peculiarly reverenced and cherished been borne from among us to the grave. Her eulogy was fitly spoken by WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON to the hearts of the great sorrowing audience, gathered to our Cause from the whole land, at the Tremont Temple: "She did not need to be translated to become an angel—she was one here on earth."

May this annually recurring festival of the heart, which, among a thousand other Anti-Slavery labors, she did so much to initiate, continue in its measure to sustain the Cause worthily!

MARIA WESTON CHAPMAN.

☞ We entreat our friends to be so kind as to inform us of any mistakes or omissions in the following list, that we may make every exertion to rectify it:

SUBSCRIPTION LIST

Of the Twenty-sixth National Anti-Slavery Anniversary (held at Boston, January 25th, 1860).

Mrs. Follen	$
Mrs. May	20 00
Mrs. Chapman	200 00
"A Friend"	100 00
Mrs. G. R. Russell	200 00
Mrs. Greene	200 00
Mrs. James M. Robbins	25 00
Mrs. Helen E. Garrison	5 00
Mrs. Convers Francis	5 00
Mrs. Samuel May, Jr.	5 00
Mrs. Von Arnim	5 00
Mrs. Child	5 00
Miss Chapman	50 00
Miss Henrietta Sargent	20 00
Miss Anne Warren Weston	25 00
Mrs. Eddy	15 00
Mrs. Smith	3 00
Mrs. E. G. Loring	40 00
Miss Griffith and friends	125 00
Mrs. Stearns	50 00
Mrs. Atkinson	5 00
Samuel May, Esq.	20 00
Mrs. Elizabeth Bartol	5 00
Rev. Samuel May, Jr.	20 00
Miss Abby W. May	5 00
F. W. G. May, Esq.	10 00
Mrs. Martha R. May	10 00
Mrs. Mary G. White	3 00
A young friend in Ireland (by Rev. S. May)	1 50
John J. May, Esq., Dorchester	20 00
Mrs. Elizabeth Porter	5 00
Miss Helen Porter	5 00
A lady, of Blackstone	5 00
Misses Lucy and Sarah Chase	3 00
Henry G. Denny, Esq.	10 00
Mrs. R. S. Denny	25 00
Miss H. L. Brown	2 00
E. S. Wells	2 00
Misses McFarland	40 00
Dr. and Mrs. Wm. Symington Brown	5 00
T. W. Ripley	2 50
Wm. H. Humphrey, Esq.	1 00
Mrs. and Miss Humphrey	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Abbee	5 00
J. C. Lindsley, Esq., Dorchester	20 00
William Pope, Esq.	5 00
Miss Sylvester	1 00
A. H. Sumner	2 00
Rev. Nathaniel Hall	3 00
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas R. Sewall	10 00
A. K. F.	50
"A Friend"	50
John Wright	50
William Proctor, Esq.	3 00
Mr. and Mrs. James Walker	5 00
"A friend of immediate emancipation"	1 00
Mr. Joseph Merrill	1 00
Mr. and Mrs. A. Bicknell	3 00
"A friend"	50
John R. Manly, Esq.	20 00
Nathan Winslow, Esq., Portland	30 00
Rev. Alfred P. Putnam, Roxbury	3 00
Cash	50
Charles Aplin, Providence, R. I.	5 00
Luther Melendy, Amherst, N. H.	2 50
Josiah Henshaw, for friends in W. Brookfield	12 00
A Parmenter, Newport, R. I.	5 00
Samuel L. Hill, Florence	25 00
Alexander Foster, Boston	25 00
Mrs. Alexander Foster, Boston	5 00
Moses Wright, Georgetown	1 00
Dr. Jesse Merrill, Hopkinton	5 00
Mr. and Mrs. David Joy	25 00
Nathaniel Barney, Esq.	20 00
Mrs. Asa French, Braintree	10 00
Mrs. M. L. Briggs, "	2 00
Oliver Johnson, Esq., N. Y.	2 00
Abraham Brooke, Esq., Ohio	1 00
A. G. Nye, Esq., Weymouth	2 00
Mrs. Nathan Brooks, Concord	10 00
Mrs. and Miss Thoreau	5 00
Hon. John G. Palfrey	5 00
John Jay, Esq., N. Y.	25 00
H. R. Helper, Esq., North Carolina	10 00
Edmund Quincy, Esq.	25 00
Mrs. Daniel P. Parker	5 00
Rev. R. C. Waterston	5 00
Mrs. Waterston	5 00
Mrs. Henry Bradlee, Upton	5 00
Mr. and Mrs. Lewis McLauthlin	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. William Whiting	10 00
Mr. and Mrs. Elias Richards	5 00
Misses Charlotte and Elizabeth Bradford	10 00
T. M. Newbold, Esq., N. Y.	1 00
Rev. J. V. Himes	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Draper	100 00
Mr. and Mrs. William I. Bowditch	50 00
Mr. and Mrs. Warren A. Dutcher	100 00
Richard Clap, Esq., Dorchester	10 00
Charles Hadwin, Esq.	1 00
Miss Elizabeth Hoar, Concord	5 00
Rev. S. J. May, Syracuse, N. Y.	10 00
"A friend" of Mrs. Robbins	3 00
Mrs. S. R. Putnam	10 00
Miss Soley	2 50
Catharine A. F. Stebbins and friends, Ann Arbor, Michigan	3 00
Elisha Clap, Esq.	5 00
Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Clap	5 00
Frederic Weiss, Esq.	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Bancroft	20 00
Mrs. Anna Castell	10 00
Isaac Osgood, Esq.	2 00
William Ashby, Esq.	5 00
Mrs. Elijah Pierce	1 00
James Hall, Esq., Boston	1 00
Thomas Sherwin, Esq.	5 00
J. Buffum, Esq., Lynn	5 00
The Misses Andrews, Newburyport	6 00
Charles K. Whipple, Esq.	3 00
Miss Julia Ireson	3 00
Miss H. I. Ireson	3 00
Miss H. M. Ireson	2 00
P. Shaw, Esq., Abington	15 00
Mrs. Hathaway, Duxbury	1 00
Mrs. Sylvanus Smith	2 00
Samuel Barrett, Esq., Concord	10 00
Mr. and Mrs. Joel W. Lewis	1 00
S. Urbino, Esq.	3 00
Mrs. R. P. Clarke	3 00
Messrs. Thayer & Eldridge	25 00
Mrs. B. Wilson, Lynn	1 00
M. L. Richmond	1 00
S. Newell	1 00
B. Blackmer	1 00
Mrs. C. T. Jackson	1 00
Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Waldo Emerson	15 00
N. White, Concord, N. H.	5 00
J. B. Pierce, Esq.	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. S. Goss	5 00
"A friend"	2 00
A. Ward	1 00
J. W. Le Barron	5 00
"Three friends"	1 50
Dr. Henry I. Bowditch	20 00
J. Winslow, Esq., Lynn	2 00
Samuel E. Sewall, Esq.	5 00
E. G. Dudley, Esq.	5 00
Jacob Leonard, Esq., East Bridgewater	5 00
Mrs. T. S. Drowne	5 00
"A friend"	1 00
William Johnson, Esq.	1 00
"A friend"	25 00
Henry G. Prentiss, Esq.	5 00
"Two ladies"	4 00
Manchester Anti-Slavery Society, by Mrs. Elwell	18 75
Mr. Dyer, Worcester	5 00
M. I. C. Nichols	5 00
Miss N. B. Wilson	1 00
"A friend"	3 00
C. T. Canfield, Walpole, N. H.	1 00
"A friend"	2 00
Otis Shepard, Esq., Dorchester	3 00
Mary L. Willard, Boston	2 00
Mrs. L. DeMortie Oliver, "	1 00
Miss Louisa Jacobs, "	2 00
J. J. Smith, Esq., "	1 00
"A friend"	1 00
Rev. James Freeman Clarke and Mrs. Anna Huidekoper Clarke,	10 00
"A friend"	1 00
Mr. and Mrs. John Jones, Roxbury,	5 00
"Cash"	1 00
A. J. Morton, Plymouth	2 00
Mrs. R. C. Waterston	5 00
O. F. Fits	1 00
Elisha L. Hammond, Esq., Northampton	5 00
Edwin Thompson, Esq., East Walpole	2 00
Mrs. Bliss, Boston	10 00
R. R. Crosby, Esq.	1 00
Mrs. John Forbes, Milton	45 00
Miss Julia Scott	25
J. L. Prince	25
Eben. Turk, Boston	2 00
W. A. Crafts, Milan, N. H.	60
Wm. Fiske, Esq., Taunton	4 00
Mrs. L. B. Merriam	10 00
WARREN, Mass., by Mrs. Blair:	
N. Richardson	3 00
John H. Powers	2 00
Dr. O. Cutter	2 00
J. B. Lombard	2 00
S. B. Richardson	1 00
Elizabeth S. Combes	1 00
M. A. B. Blair	1 00
FRIENDS, by Miss Tufts:	
Mrs. J. B. Blanchard	1 00
Miss A. W. Cotton	1 00
J. B. Smith	2 00
J. P. Coburn	2 00
Coffin Pitts	50
S. D. Revallion	50
LEOMINSTER, Mass., by Rev. Stephen Barker:	
Isaac Smith	1 50
Mary B. Smith	50
Charlotte H. Smith	50
Henry R. Smith	50
Mrs. Almira Locke	50
Mrs. Blanchard	25
Joseph Collins	50
Charles O. Nichols	25
Jonas Colburn	50
Joseph Colburn	25
Charles May	17
Bartemus Carter	23
Charles L. Joslin	50
Calvin B. Cook	50
Mrs. E. H. Blodgett	25
Mrs. Lydia L. Walker	3 00
Rev. Stephen Barker	2 00
Mrs. E. E. Knapp	50
Dr. C. C. Field	1 00
Solon Carter	1 00
John Snow	25
Sumner L. Carter	50
Timothy Lincoln	50
Edward Wilder	1 00
Albert Crane	1 00
Isaac Cowdrey	50
William S. Hale	50
Joel Smith	2 00
David Howe, Jr.	1 00
Asa I. Newhall	1 00
Mrs. J. W. Fletcher	1 00
James H. Carter	84
Friends	76
Hon. James M. Robbins	25 00
Portsmouth friends, by Mrs. Hatch	10 00
James Savage, Esq., Boston	8 00
Miss Quincy	10 00
William Foster, Esq.	10 00
N. Bent	5 00
Mrs. E. G. Tucker	5 00
Samuel Hall, Jr., Esq.	10 00
Three friends	2 00
Miss Catharine Robbins	3 00
Hon. W. Hotchkiss	2 00
Mr. Clifton	1 00
George S. Winslow, Esq.	25 00
J. B. Smith	1 00
P. Brigham	1 00
Mrs. Jacobs	1 00
W. P. Garrison, Boston	5 00
John Ritchie, 2d	5 00
Mrs. M. E. Whitcomb, Brooklyn, Conn.	2 50
Mr. Bradford	1 00
Edward Pierce, Esq., Milton	1 00
H. L. Pierce	2 00
E. P. McElroy	1 00
Two friends	2 00
William Lloyd Garrison	5 00
Mrs. Ebenezer Smith	1 00
Ellen W. Easte	50
Mary M. Hunt and N. Sedgwick	2 50
Sarah M. Hunt	3 00
Mrs. Charles F. Hovey	10 00
Miss S. Ford	1 00
Mrs. L. A. Reed	5 00
Mrs. Lydia Spooner	3 00
Mrs. David Mack	1 00
Miss Fanny Garrison	1 00
Master Frank J. Garrison	1 00
J. G. Dodge, Esq.	5 00
T. B. Drew	3 00
PORTLAND, ME.	
FRIENDS, by Rev. Frederick Frothingham:	40 00
Russell Marston, Esq.	5 00
Mrs. William Ashby, Newburyport	2 00
A. B. Peck	1 00
Henry B. Larned	2 00
Isaac H. Marshall	1 00
Maria S. Page	1 00
Eunice G. Page	1 00
S. H. Young	2 00
S. W. Magill	5 00
Joseph Cotton, Esq.	10 00
T. F. Von Arnim	5 00
Mrs. Sumner	1 00
Deborah Kimball	2 00
Mrs. Julia Meloon	5 00
Mrs. H. B. Emerson	2 00
A Little Friend	25
Mrs. Hughes	1 00
A Friend	25
Mary Wiggin	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. G. M. Rogers	5 00
Mr. and Mrs. Ober, Boston	20 00
Maria A. Sawin	1 00
H. L. Young	1 00
Mrs. M. R. Marcy	1 00
George T. Garrison	5 00
S. H. Simpson	2 00
Miss Johnson	25
LYNN, MASS.	
P. A. Chase, Esq.	5 00
Wm. A. Brown	5 00
S. N. Breed, Esq.	1 00
Harrison Newhall, Esq.	3 00
S. P. Richardson, Esq.	1 00
Warren Newhall, Esq.	5 00
Rachel Smith	5 00
S. O. Breed	1 00
William Bassett, Esq.	2 00
William Bassett, Jr.	2 00
"Three Friends"	6 00
J. E. Oliver	2 00
Joshua Patch	2 00
"A friend"	1 00
L. N. Hallowell	1 00
"A friend"	1 00
Mrs. Lydia H. Chase	5 00
George Ross	1 00
Mr. and Mrs. Alvan Howes	15 00
Mrs. Thomas Starr King	10 00
Mrs. Lydia O. Le Favre	1 00
Mrs. Wm. Ives	2 00
Mrs. S. E. Lane	2 00
Miss Mary J. Parkman	10 00
Mrs. N. White	5 00
Mrs. Morrill	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. David Mack	2 00
Mr. and Mrs. Joshua Putnam	5 00
Mr. and Mrs. J. L. Whiting	3 00
Mrs. Foss	1 00
Charles A. Faber, Esq., Lynn	2 00
Miss Nowell, Cambridgeport	3 00
Misses Frances and Eliza Haskell, Chelsea	2 00
Mr. Williams	1 50
Mrs. Richard Hallowell, Medford	3 00
"A Friend"	3 00
Paul D. Wallis	2 00
Perley King, Esq., Danvers	20 00
Mrs. E. Stebbins	5 00
S. B. Stebbins	5 00
Mrs. Sibley, Chelsea	5 00
"A Friend"	3 00
C. Wellington	5 00
Miss Julia A. Robbins, East Lexington	1 00
H. S. Shepard	1 00
Mrs. Louisa Willis	5 00
Mr. and Mrs. B. F. Danforth	10 00
Mrs. Fitz, Brookline	1 00
A Friend	32
Miss Anna Logan	1 00
J. H. Stephenson, Esq., West Newton	10 00
Mrs. Lucinda Smith Otis	20 00
Mrs. James Nowell	10 00
A Friend	50
Mrs. Sparrell, Boston	1 00
Wm. L. Garrison, Jr.	5 00
Mrs. Henry Curtis	4 00
James N. Buffum, Esq. Lynn	20 00
Wm. Sparrell	5 00
Mrs. Cumberlain	1 00
J. B. Swasey, Boston	3 00
Chas. L. Mitchell "	1 00
Isaac Orr Guild	1 00
M. S. Morse	1 00
Richard Plummer, Newburyport	2 00
Wm. Walley	1 00
Elizabeth Doton	3 00
Mrs. M. J. Silloway	5 00
A. H. Silloway	1 00
Mr. Russell	5 00
Cash	3 00
H. B. Draper	2 00
Martin Rogers	1 00
Atkinson Stanwood, Esq., Newburyport	3 00
Mrs. Robie	15 00
A Friend	25
W. S. Cobb	1 00
George T. Goldthwaite	1 00
W. Bruce	25
Mr. and Mrs. Thaxter, Hingham	5 00
A Worcester Friend	2 50
Mr. Jenkins	5 00
Mrs. M. S. Jenkins	5 00
Bourne Spooner, Esq., Plymouth	5 00
A friend in Salem	10 00
A friend in Worcester	10 00
Edgar Ketchum, Esq., N. Y.	10 00
Mrs. A. Mann, N. Y.	5 00
Francis Jackson, Esq.	50 00
Lauren Wetmore, Esq. (by F. J.)	20 00
Miss Lucy Osgood	10 00
Mrs. Waterston	5 00
Mrs. John Pierpont	5 00
Mr. and Mrs. James S. Draper, Wayland	6 00
Miss M. C. Shannon	2 00
Josiah Hayward, Esq.	2 00
Josiah Hayward, Jr.	2 00
Edward B. Perkins, Esq.	5 00
Elizabeth P. Perkins	1 00
Two friends	2 00
Mrs. Jewett	2 00
E. S. Remond	1 00
Thomas B. Rice	2 00
Daniel S. Whitney	1 00
H. & P. C. Whitney	1 00
Mary Robinson	75
B. Schlesinger, Esq.	5 00
T. W. Hartshorn	1 00
John C. Haynes	10 00
Rev. A. T. Foss	1 00
John Oliver	1 00
Eugene Hutchinson	1 00
Mr. and Mrs. Ezekiel Thatcher	5 00
A Huidekoper, Esq.	1 00
Richard Tyner	25
Louisa I. Thompson	1 00
Mrs. R. B. Andrews, Salem	5 00
E. Mundrucu, Esq.	2 00
Miss Scudder	3 00
Mrs. Littlehale	6 00
Mrs. S. W. Cheney	3 00
Mrs. Elizabeth Hall	75
Charles E. Hodges Esq.	5 00
J. B. Yerrinton	2 00
Mrs. Wm. G. Weld	10 00
Mrs. Mary B. Merriam	8 00
Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Carter	10 00
Miss Sarah M. Babcock	5 00
Mrs. R. W. Dresser	1 00
Andrew Robeson, Esq., New Bedford	50 00
Mrs. B. A. Fisk	1 00
A friend	1 00
Miss E. Cushing, Hingham	5 00

EUROPEAN SUBSCRIPTIONS.

	£	s.	d.
Thos. and Esther Sturge, Northfleet, near Gravesend, England,	200	0	0
Robert Topp, Esq., Farworth, near Bolton, by Mrs. H. Payne,	5	0	0
Mrs. Reid and Miss Sturch, London,	15	0	0
Mrs. Henry Turner, Nottingham,	2	2	0
Mrs. Harriet Martineau, The Knoll, Ambleside,	5	0	0
Mrs. George Martineau,	2	2	0
Mrs. Michell, Bridgewater,	5	0	0
PERTH Ladies' Anti-Slavery Soc., by Mrs. D. Morton,	13	10	6
BOLTON, LANCASHIRE.			
By Mrs. H. Payne,	22	0	0
From Miss Howarth,	1	0	0
Martha Bradshaw,	1	0	0
Robert Topp, Falmouth,	5	0	0
Sarah P. Remond's lecture,	2	15	0
William Makant,	1	0	0
R. Knowles,	0	10	0
Mrs. C. Heaton,	0	10	0
Miss Rothwill,	0	5	0
Sophia Satterthwaite,	0	5	0
Mrs. Jabez Johnson,	0	10	0
Mrs. Mascroft,	0	5	0
Mrs. Deane,	0	5	0
Mrs. Wood,	0	5	0
Mrs. Orton,	0	5	0
Mrs. H. Cook,	0	5	0
Mrs. John Hodgkinson,	0	10	0
Mrs. James Cook, Chamber-Hall,	0	10	0
Mrs. J. Knowles,	0	10	0
Mrs. George Knowles,	0	5	0
Constantine Brothers,	0	10	0
Mrs. Heywood,	0	7	6
David Crossley,	0	5	0
Miss Crossley,	0	10	0
Miss Lord,	0	10	0
Mr. Peterson,	0	10	0
Peter Martin,	0	10	0
Samuel Hodgkinson,	0	10	0
"A friend,"	0	20	0
William Slade,	0	10	0
Henry and Shaw,	0	5	0
Mr. Richardson,	1	17	6
Smaller subscriptions,	1	14	0
Deducted in Bolton for expenses,			
MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.			
By Miss Whittlegge,	14	0	0
EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.			
By Mrs. Wigham [including subscriptions from friends in ULVERSTONE, by Ann T. Jackson, £3 5s. 6d.—in PRESTON, by Elizabeth Abbatt, £6—in LEIGH, by Elizabeth Fletcher, £6 10s.—and of Jas. Inglis, DUMFERMLINE, £1 10s.],	52	10	0
WARRINGTON, LANCASHIRE.			
By Wm. Robson, Esq. (including first contribution),	35	0	0
John Mawson, Newcastle-on-Tyne,	5	0	0
HALIFAX, ENGLAND.			
By Mrs. Joseph Thorpe, through Mr. Lupton,	22	12	6
LEEDS, ENGLAND.			
By J. Lupton, Esq., including £5 from Young Men's LEEDS Anti-Slavery Society,	27	7	0
DUBLIN, IRELAND.			
By Mrs. Edmondson, £30—as follows:			
Isabella Shaw and Miss Nash,	0	5	0
William Malone,	0	10	0
Joseph Gray,	0	5	0
C. Painter,	0	2	0
Ellen and Charlotte Allen,	0	10	0
Work sold,	0	12	0
Louisa Phelps,	2	6	0
Mary Edmundson,	5	0	0
Henry Wigham,	2	10	0
J. R. Wigham,	2	10	0
Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society,	8	16	0
From Margaret Barrington,	1	0	0
Collected by Miss Moses,	1	10	0
" by Miss Litton,	1	6	6
" by Charlotte Fisher,	1	2	0
From S. Pim,	0	5	0
DUBLIN.			
By Miss Haughton,			
From James Haughton, Esq.,	8	15	0
Mrs. Alfred Haughton,	3	0	0
Samuel Haughton, Esq.,	1	0	0
Mrs. W. Neilson Hancock,	1	0	0
The Misses Haughton,	0	5	0
Miss Kennedy,	0	15	0
James Haughton, Jr., Esq.,	0	5	0
John B. Richardson, Esq.,	0	5	0
Mrs. Hutton,	1	0	0
By R. D. Webb, Esq.			
Mrs. Hutton, Edenfield,	1	0	0
Alfred Webb,	1	0	0
Mrs. Richard Allen,	6	0	0
Richard D. Webb,	10	0	0
WATERFORD, by R. D. Webb, Esq.			
Mrs. Maria Palmer,	10	0	0
Elizabeth Harvey,	1	0	0
T. S. Harvey,	0	10	0
P. N. Harvey,	0	10	0
A friend,	1	0	0
Ann and Isabella Harvey,	0	7	0
Collected by Margaret White,	1	3	2
GLASGOW.			
By Andrew Paton, Esq.,	35	0	0
BRISTOL, ENGLAND.			
By Mrs. Stephens and Miss Estlin,	46	2	0
PARIS.			
Madame Meynieu, by Madame Langel, 40 francs.			

POSTPONED.—Deeming it important, for special reasons, to fill the fourth page this week with other matter, we have necessarily postponed the current chapter of Miss Griffith's story. We trust there will be no such interruption hereafter. Our inside columns, too, are so crowded that we are compelled to defer a letter from our Philadelphia Correspondent, a letter from Paris, the letter from Stephen S. Foster to which we alluded last week, and much other matter for which we earnestly desired to find room.

ERRATUM.—In our Report of the Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society last week, the names of the Treasurer and Auditor were erroneously transposed. They should stand as follows:

Treasurer—EDMUND JACKSON, Esq.
Auditor—W. I. BOWDITCH, Esq.

AARON D. STEVENS, another of the companions of John Brown at Harper's Ferry, has been found guilty upon all the charges in the indictment. Hazlitt, at the time we write, is on trial. We have no space for particulars.

"THE PERSONAL LIBERTY PETITIONS," writes a friend at Albany, are coming in to the Legislature in large numbers, much to our satisfaction." No time should be lost in forwarding those that remain behind.

Advertisements.

THE INDEPENDENT.

A Weekly Journal, published in New York City, numbering among its Correspondents the following distinguished writers:
JOHN G. WHITTIER,
JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL,
GEORGE B. CHEEVER,
MRS. HARRIET BEECHER STOWE,
REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER,
REV. STEPHEN H. TYNG, D.D.,
WILLIAM ALLEN BUTLER, ESQ.,
Author of "Nothing to Wear."
A SERMON BY REV. HENRY W. BEECHER
appears every week.
TERMS: By mail, Two Dollars a year, payable in advance.
JOSEPH H. RICHARDS, PUBLISHER,
No. 5 Beekman street, N. Y.

A SPLENDID IMPERIAL PHOTOGRAPH from BRACKETT'S celebrated BUST of CAPT. JOHN BROWN, by BLACK and BATCHELDER, of Boston, has been received. This picture has met with the unqualified approval of Wendell Phillips, The New York Tribune, Anti-Slavery Standard and other leading journals. It is pronounced to be the best PORTRAIT of CAPT. JOHN BROWN yet executed. It will be furnished at the remarkably low price of Two Dollars, or framed at Three and Four Dollars. Sold at Wholesale and Retail by S. T. MUNSON, General Agent, 143 Fulton street, N. Y.

STOP BLEEDING!—STOP SPITTING BLOOD!!—REMEDY READY.—A certain cure for Hemorrhage. Highest testimonials. Send for a Circular. In boxes containing 12 powders, at $2; or sent by mail in envelopes, 6 powders for $1. Sold by S. T. MUNSON, Wholesale and Retail Agent, 143 Fulton street, N. Y.

"THE FAMILY PAPER."
$5 a day.—Female Agents WANTED at home or to travel, on salary or commission, for the LARGEST AND HANDSOMEST ILLUSTRATED FAMILY PAPER in the world. For "Confidential Terms," to Female Agents, and a copy of the Paper, enclose a stamp to MARIE LOUISE HANKINS & Co., New York City.

MECHANICS AND MANUFACTURERS will do well to introduce LIFE ILLUSTRATED into their families and establishments. On trial 3 months for 25 cents.

FARMERS and their Wives, Sons and Daughters—all ought to see LIFE ILLUSTRATED. Only a Quarter for three months. FOWLER AND WELLS, N. Y.

REPORTS of the N. Y. Polytechnic Association of the American Institute given in LIFE ILLUSTRATED, 4 copies, 3 months on trial, $1.

THE N. Y. Farmers' Club of the American Institute. For a general report of its transactions, see LIFE ILLUSTRATED. Sent three months for 25 cents. Address FOWLER AND WELLS, New York.

LIFE ILLUSTRATED.—A First-Class Pictorial Family Newspaper, devoted to Agriculture, Mechanics, Architecture, new Inventions; to Improvement, Entertainment and News. $2 a year; or 3 copies, $5; five copies, $8; ten copies, $10; Address FOWLER AND WELLS, New York.

ON TRIAL.—"LIFE ILLUSTRATED is one of the best papers published in the United States. We know of no more instructive and interesting publication for family reading."—Panama Star. Sent three months for 25 cents.

P. O. STAMPS or other U. S. currency may be sent in a letter for LIFE ILLUSTRATED, which is not filled with "trash" or quack medicines; it is an elegant quarto of eight pages, a perfect model of excellence, altogether one of the most sensible of live papers. Only $2 a year, $1 for half a year, and on trial three months for 25 cents. Address FOWLER AND WELLS, New York.

SHE CAN'T KEEP HOUSE WITHOUT IT.—A mother says: "Having been a subscriber for LIFE ILLUSTRATED three years, I feel that I cannot keep house without it." A sample of letters received by us daily. Sent 3 months for 25 cents. FOWLER AND WELLS, New York.

THE AMERICAN RAILROAD GUIDE says, "LIFE ILLUSTRATED is the paragon of periodicals." A Quarter gives it to you 3 months. FOWLER AND WELLS, New York.

GOOD LOOKING.—"LIFE ILLUSTRATED is one of the most beautiful specimens of newspaper printing we have ever seen."—Christian Advocate. Everybody ought to see it once a week; 3 months at 25 cents. FOWLER AND WELLS, New York.

HARK!—Listen to the wise men of the Scientific American. They say: "LIFE ILLUSTRATED—It is of large size and faultless typography. Almost every branch of human knowledge is treated by able writers." Only $2 a year.

NO Trash, or foolish nonsense, ever appears in LIFE ILLUSTRATED. It is a first-class, high-toned, live family paper. $2 a year. On trial 3 months for 25 cents.

A QUARTER Dollar gives you LIFE ILLUSTRATED 3 months. FOWLER AND WELLS, New York.

A SHORT VOYAGE FOR 25 CENTS. Take LIFE ILLUSTRATED 3 months. FOWLER AND WELLS, New York

THE STANDARD.

SPEECH OF THEODORE TILTON.

(Continued from First Page.)

he delivered a lecture in New York on "Politics and Religion," in which, as if on purpose to throw out a quiet commentary on his speech of the night before, he uttered these words, which I find in *The Tribune's* report:

"Wherever you find a man whose politics and religion are kept separate, you always find that his politics are the cream, and his religion the skim milk." To which the reporter's account then adds, "great applause!" (Laughter.)

Now, sir, this is called the Goodwater platform; let us call it rather the good *milk and water platform!* (Loud laughter.)

But some of the missionaries themselves have repudiated these very Goodwater declarations. I quote a letter from the Choctaw missionaries, printed in *The New York Observer* of Dec. 23, 1858. I will merely state that as soon as the missionaries had signed and sealed this document, the Board at Utica said, "We have got the missionaries to say something"; the anti-slavery men said, "We have something to be satisfied with"; but the very moment the missionaries heard of what the Board said, they repudiated what they themselves said. They wrote in a letter:

"The construction put upon the Goodwater platform, by the Board at Utica, makes it impossible for us to regard that as an expression of our principles."

So much, therefore, for the Goodwater platform!

Now, last of all in this documentary chain, I come to the last annual report: that of 1859. Mr. Treat, having done with the Epistles to the Corinthians, now undertakes to write an Epistle to the Choctaws. He says:

"It is proper that we should review, in the fewest possible words, the history of a question which has received so much attention within the last few years. *You remark that your policy had 'the full approbation of the Secretaries and the Prudential Committee for more than five and twenty years, and was finally approved with perfect unanimity by the Board at Brooklyn.' For much of the time since the meeting at Brooklyn, we have supposed that there was no material difference between your mission and ourselves. In the year 1848, indeed, there seemed to be some divergency; but in the following year you declared your assent to the letter of the Cherokee mission, dated March 21, 1848, 'as expressing in a clear and condensed manner' your 'main views and principles'; and verbal statements, subsequently made by some of your number, gave the Committee very great satisfaction.*"

What, sir, is the implication of this paragraph? What was it that gave the Committee such "very great satisfaction"? It was in looking back, in 1859, to the "main views and principles" of 1848. What were these? Why, they were the declarations drawn up by the Rev. Mr. Worcester, which I have already read; showing that the missionaries had found a way to receive slaveholders into the Church, and to sanction it from the Bible; that they had found a way of admitting them to Christ's communion without exacting a pledge that they "would not live and die slaveholders"; that they had found a way of giving them the right hand of fellowship in the Church and still allowing them to buy and sell their fellow-men, as property, under the pleasant and easy phrase of "occasional exchanges of masters"; that they had found a way of advancing Christ's kingdom on the earth by the separation of little children from their parents, and sending them to the auction-block to be sold! These, sir, *these* were the "main views and principles" which gave the Committee such "very great satisfaction"!

Yet here is where my friend says he stands, and where he is not ashamed to stand! At this point he takes leave of the argument, and says to this Missionary Board, "God speed, venerable Board!" Here he remembers, and recounts with bewitching humor, how, in his early days, he drove a fast horse with a missionary, and got over, in half an hour, a road which it took his father an hour and a-half to travel (laughter).

Now, what was the action of the Board at its last meeting? The history of forty-three years was well known. The fact of slaveholding in the Mission Churches was well known. The uninterrupted agitation since 1841 was well known. The steadfast resistance of the Board to the cause of freedom was well known. All this was known—known for years, and known, moreover, as stigmatized by thousands of Christian men as a shame and a reproach. But now came another annual meeting; now came another chance of remedying the past; now came a full and free opportunity to speak a word which should at last atone for the silence of forty years! But what was done at this last meeting, held in Philadelphia? A resolution was offered declaring that slaveholding should be regarded as *prima facie* evidence that the slaveholder was unfit for church membership. It was drawn by Dr. Cheever, in the following words:

"That, in the opinion of the Board, the holding of slaves be pronounced an immorality, inconsistent with membership in any Christian Church; and that it ought to be required that these Missionary Churches should immediately put away from themselves this sin, and should cease to sanction it even in appearance."

What is the meaning of that resolution? It means that when a man, holding a yoke on the neck of a slave, comes and asks admission to the Church, the fact should be regarded, at first blush, as a strong evidence against him, and that he should be required to prove himself clear of guilt before he could be received. Was that not fair? Nay, sir, was not that moderate? If the Board had been at that time, as Mr. Beecher claimed it to be, an anti-slavery body, would not an anti-slavery body have passed that resolution? Well, sir, what was the fate of the resolution? It was swept clear of the house by a unanimous vote to lay it upon the table!

Nor was this all. A respectful and temperate memorial against the revival of the slave trade was similarly cleared from the docket—crowded over into another year, in order to be pushed to a safe distance from the critical time when it was most needed! This is the Board's last record on the subject of slavery—a refusal to utter a word of condemnation against a traffic which consists in the theft of human beings!

In view, therefore, of these evidences—and these are but a small part of what might have been given—I openly declare that the American Board is in palpable complicity with American slavery. I have quoted to you their own reports. I have made no statements of fact which I have not furnished documentary proof. Have I not, in view of these proofs, shown that my friend uttered a mistaken judgment when he declared that the record of the Board, on the subject of slavery, was "clean, clear and pure!"

But, sir, shut the books and records! I have no taste for this kind of reasoning; I do not like mere technical argument; I never was born to be a lawyer. What are the great facts that have been for forty years staring the whole world in the face?

This mission to the Cherokees was founded in 1817; it is now more than two-score years old; the missionaries have been at their work until they have grown gray; they have moulded the mission with their own hands; they have made it a moral power against all the sins of the Indians, except their greatest sin; they have set on foot among that semi-barbarous people all the reforms of Christianity, except the single one that was most needed; they have made Christian quarrel with every wrong, but the greatest wrong; they have borne testimony against every villany, but the sum of all villanies! To-day, there is drunkenness among those Indians, and the missionaries testify against that; there is gambling, and they testify against that; there is theft, and they testify against that; there is slavery, and they *shut their mouths!*

The missionaries have to a great degree shaped the civilization of the Cherokees; yet in reclaiming these savages from one barbarism, they have sanctioned them in another; they have converted them from a heathenism of ignorance to teach them a heathenism of oppression. The Indians, growing up under the influence of the mission stations, have been taught to believe that they can hold their slaves inside the Church as they held them outside. The teachings of the missionaries, and the action of the Board, have failed to make the impression upon those haughty half-breeds that to hold, and buy, and sell their fellow creatures as property is incompatible with the Christian religion!

You will recollect that, years ago, this Missionary Board arose, in the providence of God, to such wide influence and power in this land that its decisions went forth almost like the imperial decrees of the first Napoleon from Paris! If the Board had chosen to act against slavery, it would have set in motion one of the greatest engines in the Church! It would have been like a battering-ram against the ramparts of oppression. I have already quoted the words of Albert Barnes, that slavery could not exist a day against the power of the Church. The American Board could have spoken the word and done the work; it wielded the power of well-nigh half the American Church; but it chose rather to allow the great opportunity of the age to go by; it shut its mouth and was dumb!

Mr. Treat made a very significant remark in 1848. He said, speaking of the Board's efforts among these Indians:

"It is very clear that the influence of the missions is *neutralized to some extent by the existence of slavery.*"

To this statement of Mr. Treat, I add a commentary of facts. In the Cherokee mission,

In 1836 there were 260 members.
" 1848 " 230 "
" 1855 " 200 "

You perceive the gradual decrease. But why should there be a *decrease?* Did not Mr. Beecher say that "usually there are more converts in Churches among the heathen than in Churches at home"? What, then, is the cause of the reversal of their general rule, among the Cherokees? Mr. Treat fatally gives the answer himself—"*Slavery neutralizes the missions*"!

That noble man and missionary, David T. Stoddard, who spent his life in the East, said:

"*We do not dare to let our converts know that slavery exists in America; for how could we reconcile it with our professions as a Christian nation?*"

But Mr. Beecher says that in looking at the past history of the Board, he finds evidence that it has been gradually growing better and better. Does he remember how, year after year, Nehemiah Adams, the man who sees only the "South-side view," has been invariably reelected a member of the Prudential Committee? Mr. Beecher, in his last evening's lecture, let fly at this same Dr. Adams an arrow that might well-nigh have stung him to death. Does Mr. Beecher think that Nehemiah Adams is wrong everywhere else, but right in the Prudential Committee? Does he not know that this annual reelection is made the occasion of an annual boasting as a triumph over what is called the fanatical New England sentiment? But Mr. Beecher says the Board is improving. Well, improving how? I heard, the other day, a capital story of Mr. Littell, the publisher of the *Living Age*. He was afflicted with a sore leg; he called a physician from a distance; the leg was treated as a serious case; the recovery was very slow; at last the physician went away, leaving directions behind him, and telling his patient to report by letter; at the end of two or three months, the doctor received a letter somewhat as follows: "Dear Sir: My leg is improving; if I look at it day by day, I do not see any advance; if I compare it week by week, I notice only very little; if I look back month by month, I see only a little more; but three months ahead perhaps I shall be able to see considerable improvement. On the whole, my leg may eventually get well, but *not in my day*" (great laughter). Now, sir, I am willing to admit that the American Board may be improving little by little, year by year; nay, sir, comparing long intervals, it may be improving considerably; still, I do not think it will be well in our day (laughter). What does it need? It needs the surgeon's knife, and that is what I ask this Church to give it!

Now, I beg you to bear in mind one thing. In the report of 1848 it is declared that

"*The Board is directly responsible for the teachings of the missionaries.*"

It is declared also that

"*When evils exist in the Mission Churches, the Prudential Committee may and must inquire whether the missionaries are performing their duty.*"

Now, we have been told, in this debate, that the Board, being not an ecclesiastical body, can have no ecclesiastical power. The Churches under its patronage, it is said, are independent of its control. The adroit excuse is offered, that the Prudential Committee at Boston have no authority over the mission at Goodwater. No, sir, this excuse is not valid. We do not ask the Committee to exercise ecclesiastical power over the missionaries. We wish them to say only this: "To our brethren over the prairies, greeting: we have no control over you or your Churches, and we wish none; but we are put in trust with and have control over the funds with which you are supported; now, we say to you frankly, if you receive slaveholders into your Churches, and so put us in complicity with slavery, we will give you no more money!" That would end the controversy in short order!

Suppose it were reported at the Missionary House in Pemberton Square that the missionaries among the Cherokees were receiving into their Churches Unitarians, or Universalists, or Roman Catholics; what would the Prudential Committee do? I tell you that the Pope of Rome never thundered a bull of excommunication more suddenly at renegade priest or Protestant heretic than the American Board would send forth a letter of excommunication of those backsliding missionaries! When any sin but the national sin comes to light, Pemberton Square gathers blackness and thunders forth its voice! Let the cry of adultery be raised against an unfortunate Secretary, and the Prudential Committee rise up in their majesty and might, and, before the evidence is rendered, before the facts are known, on the first blush of suspicion, they say, "Cut him off! cut him off!" Thus they cut off Dr. Pomroy before there was the slightest evidence of his guilt; sentencing him on a day's suspicion; while there, in their Cherokee Churches, they have had abundant evidence that, not for a day, but for forty years, there has been sanctioned and sustained a system which is not only the mother of adultery, but of every other sin; and yet the Prudential Committee, with marvellous consistency, cut loose their Secretary, but hold fast their slaveholders! I have heard of a woman who was asked what she thought of the doctrine of total depravity, and who replied that it was "a very good doctrine if people would only *live up to it*" (laughter). Now, the Prudential Committee, of course, instruct their missionaries to preach the doctrine of total depravity; the missionaries preach it, and are in that respect very orthodox and sound; but, in justice to them, it must be also said that they not only preach, but practise it (laughter).

My friend, in one of his rapid incidental references, mentioned that "the opposing Society, the American Missionary Association, had been brought to deal with slave-hiring among their own missionaries." The fact is not exactly as Mr. Beecher stated it. There is in Siam an institution resembling slavery. A man is in debt and cannot pay; he is held in bondage till he can: the worst way in the world to pay a debt! I am willing to admit that this is slavery. Now, one of the missionaries of the new Society, the Rev. Dr. Bradley, employed in his service a man who was held in that kind of bondage for debt. But what then? The other missionaries of the station immediately came together and said, "This is hiring slaves, and we must discountenance it." So, by a unanimous vote, they disapproved his act, and sent the record of their disapproval to the Executive Committee at New York. Their resolution was commended by the Committee, who sent back explicit word to the missionaries never again to hire a man whose labor brought no reward to himself. But can Mr. Beecher, or can anybody else, tell me why it was that Dr. Bradley fell into the error of employing slave labor? I will tell you how it happened. Dr. Bradley had been newly received into the employment of the new Society, after having spent many years in the service of the American Board—and there is where he learned it! (Laughter.)

My friend said that the American Board had purged its missions from Caste. You know that caste among the Hindoos operates almost as slavery among us. Mr. Beecher had a right to speak of this freedom from caste as a credit to the Board. But how did the Board clear itself of caste? Rev. Mr. Winslow was the first man among the missionaries to attack it. He excommunicated seven members from his Church because of their adherence to caste. Tell me what that caste was! If a man of high caste was converted and came into the Church, and a man of low caste was converted and came into the Church, they preserved their caste inside, as they had preserved it outside, the Church; like the Jews and the Samaritans, they would have no dealings with each other. Mr. Winslow said to these men, "But you must sit and eat at the same communion-table, because you are all brethren in Christ"; and because they refused, one caste standing on one side of the wall and another on the other, *he excommunicated them.* And afterwards the Madura mission *excommunicated seventy-two members at one blow*, most of whom were catechists, or native teachers, because not one of them would come into a house and eat bread with another of a different caste! Now, I say, if the American Board regards the fact that one man will not eat bread with another in his own house such a sin that they must cut off seventy-two church-members for the offence, is it not high time that the Prudential Committee should say, "As we have cut off these seventy-two members for refusing to eat bread together, shall we not the rather cut off seventeen members who, for forty years, have been stealing the labor of black men and selling their wives and children?" For, am I unreasonable when I hold it to be a greater sin to enslave a man than to refuse to eat with him?

My friend's allusion, therefore, to the Board as having freed itself from caste was a very unfortunate one for his argument; for the only thing we ask of the American Board is to free itself from slavery, with as much zeal as it freed itself from caste, and in exactly the same way—by cutting off the offender. Does not consistency require it? If the excision be needed in one case, is it not *more* needed in the other?

The inquiry now arises, Why should we cut off our contributions from the Board just at the present time? I will tell you why, and this was one reason why I brought this map. [Mr. Tilton here referred again to the map of Indian Territory.] You perceive that on the north of Indian Territory lies Kansas, on the east Missouri, and on the south Arkansas. Now, sir, at this very moment secret machinations are going on, between the Southern Missourians and the Cherokee leaders, to bring in the Cherokee nation as a new territory by itself, and of course as a slave Territory. You will see the geographical reason for this attempt. Missouri is to be free in a very few years (sagacious men on the ground say five years), not by emancipating her slaves, as many people at the East suppose, but by selling them to other masters. Now, if they sell them, whither shall they be taken? Not to Kansas, for that is free; not to Arkansas, for the people are too poor to pay a high price; not to Texas, for that is too far away. There is no place, then, where Missouri can empty out her slaves unless the Indian country can be made into slave States. The first proposed slave State is the Cherokee district. Therefore the politicians want to make it certain that this intermediate ground shall be opened to slavery, on the firm foundation of State governments, and hence their machinations to accomplish that object. Now, against these secret, political plottings, remember that there is no indoctrination of the gospel of liberty, no exertion of the moral power of the Church, no steady offsetting influence by the missionaries. How far has this game gone on? Mr. Sebastian, the other day, introduced a resolution into the Senate providing that the same laws and regulations which are usually given for the government of the territories be extended to the Cherokee nation; so that already the movement is on foot.

Now, sir, tell me how that beautiful country that lies north of the Cherokees was saved to freedom? [pointing to Kansas]. Mr. Beecher can tell! It was done by the rousing of the whole North to the necessity of making Kansas a free State. It was by the universal excitement created in the North that Kansas was saved. And how did we save it? I will tell you a story of a green bag. [Mr. Tilton here produced a green bag, which, on being opened, was found to contain a Sharp's rifle, which he held up to the audience.] I wish to remind Mr. Beecher how he helped to make Kansas a free State.

Mr. Garrett—I rise to a point of order. The gentleman's remarks are not to the question. What relation has this rifle to the American Board?

Mr. Tilton—I will tell you! This instrument—well dinted by long use—was dedicated by the pastor of this Church to the cause of freedom in Kansas.

Mr. Garrett continued his interruption on the point of order, but was called to order by the chair.

Mr. Tilton—This was one of the original twenty-five rifles for which Mr. Beecher, during the Kansas excitement, went around among the members of his Church making personal solicitation and continual appeal to every one, saying, "Give me money to buy twenty-five rifles for Kansas." This rifle has performed its mission; it has seen good service there (applause).

A Gentleman—Is it loaded? (Laughter.)

Mr. Tilton—No! (laughter)—only with an argument! I will not stop to tell you the history of this weapon; only that it was carried three months by Capt. John Brown (applause and hisses). It was present at the battle of Osawatomie (loud applause followed by hisses and renewed applause).

The Chair—Gentlemen are provoking by their hisses the very thing they are trying to stop. I insist upon order.

Mr. Tilton—I will tell you the reason why I exhibit this weapon. When that territory (pointing to Kansas) was in danger of falling into the hands of the Slave Power, Mr. Beecher's heart was touched to such a degree that he went around among you all, and, by personal appeal, procured the money to purchase this rifle, which was sent, with two dozen others, to guard the liberties of the people of Kansas. But at this moment, sir, at this very moment, the Cherokee country is in the same peril of coming into the Union as a new slave Territory, and I come to Mr. Beecher and ask him to send—what? A rifle? No. But only the testimony of a strong word! I ask him to remember his heroic appeals of '56, and now, when there is no necessity for weapons of carnal warfare, now that the time has come when the shedding of blood is no longer required, I ask him only to send forth, in place of his Sharp's rifles, an easier and milder testimony, which will make glad again the hearts of those free men who made Kansas free! (Applause.)

Sir, I have done with the gun (laughter). But let me say a word in conclusion. My friend, Mr. Benedict, the merchant, in the early part of this debate, charged me with chasing one idea, as he said, "up hill and down dale." Well, sir, here [pointing to the Cherokee country] are hills and dales; and I know of one idea, sir, which I would chase up, and down, and over, and through these same hills and dales—an idea which I would chase through every cabin and hovel, through every cave and solitary place, through every forest and plantation; I mean, sir, the idea that this beautiful country shall ever be brought into the Union as a slave State! Yes, sir, I would chase it through every mission station, and every Church; I would chase it up and down everywhere, until it should be chased out even from the dingy Missionary House in Pemberton Square! I am not afraid of chasing one idea—particularly the idea that the American nation is to suffer the shame of a new slave State without a struggle to save itself against the encroachment, without an arousing of the North to this new peril of freedom, without the sounding of a trumpet to the American Board, invoking it to utter the voice of its missions against so great a crime, without an appeal to this Church, that once raised its strong right hand, armed like a warrior, to defend the freedom of Kansas, to lift up at least its solemn warning voice against the wrong of wicked men seizing a new, young State and leading it into the Union in chains!

Sir, if I ever chase one idea, I only say, let it be an idea which is worth chasing! (Laughter.)

I tell you, friends and brethren, if the Cherokee nation is finally made a slave State, then, in the language of the covenant which the minister of this Church reads from this pulpit to every new-coming member on his profession of faith, "*This day and this hour will be everlasting witnesses against you*"! But if this Territory be saved as a free State, as of old the very stones cried out when men held their peace, the corner-stone of its freedom will bear witness that it was laid this night in this Church!

Sir, the name of this Church, and of its minister, will go into history. Many men in many lands, lovers of their race and watchers of the progress of the age, are looking to this Church as fulfilling many noble and generous hopes. We are a marked Church; this man is a marked minister. A city that is set upon a hill cannot be hid. We are watched from afar—across the sea, and in foreign lands! We are known everywhere as a Church that stands for the Rights of Men. I never have been in Europe, but I have been told that in the famous Church of St. Ouen, in one of the cities of France, if you look into the font you will see, reflected in the water, the whole grand architecture of pillar, and arch, and roof! So, when the world looks into Plymouth Church, it sees reflected in the light of this single question its whole history, and character, and glory! By and bye, when the long story of this great struggle comes to be written, when the full record of these stormy times comes at last to be made up and completed, the question will be asked, "Where did this Church stand? where did its minister stand?" Ah, sir, if our answer to-night be not clear and true, we shall cast upon our fair fame a shadow and a cloud!

To-night there come to us from the prairies, through the long distance of a thousand miles, the piteous appeals of two thousand slaves in the land of the Cherokees to two thousand free men in Plymouth Church. They say to us to-night, "Brethren, we are in bonds; we have religious teachers among us who teach the strange religion that Christian men may hold us in unchristian bonds; we have heard of your Church, and of your minister; we have been told that you are the friends of the oppressed; we are in chains; we send you an appeal for liberty. Brethren, hear us, and loose us from our bonds!"

Men and women of Plymouth Church! This is the touching plea that comes to us at this hour! Hark! You can hear it at this moment, mingled with the sighings of the west wind! A plea that comes again, as once before, when we all listened and wept, from under the thatched roof of the cabin of Uncle Tom! What answer shall we send back to these petitioners? If you cast your vote to sustain this Missionary Board, to endorse its complicity with the enslavement of these Christian slaves, you say to every one of those dusky men and women who are now crying out to this Church, "Hush your plea! smother your cry! wear your chains!"

Are you willing to make such a record, while God stands looking down from Heaven to read it? In the name of justice, in the name of humanity—nay, sir, in the name of Christ's love, and for the sake of Christ's poor—I beseech you to stand with the oppressed against the oppressor! I pray God to give us wisdom, and justice, and courage!

[Mr. Tilton took his seat amid loud and long-continued applause.]

MR. BEECHER AND THE AMERICAN BOARD.

As we have given place, in preceding columns, to Mr. Tilton's speech in reply to Henry Ward Beecher's defence of the American Board, it is no more than just that we should lay before our readers some report of that defence. The speech has not been reported in full, but we give what we suppose to be a fair sketch, partly from *The Tribune*, and partly from *The Express*.

MR. BEECHER'S SPEECH.

He intended to maintain to-night, first, that the American Board was the proper depository of the contributions of this Church of those funds by which it is desired to preach the gospel in foreign lands; secondly, that, while he was entirely and perfectly willing that the American Missionary Association should have a collection, he could not do it at the expense of the American Board; thirdly, that the American Board had to an unparalleled degree kept pace with public sentiment on the subject of slavery, and now held anti-slavery doctrines, and had faithfully and consistently applied these doctrines to missionary work, and that it was clean, clear and pure on this whole subject. This Society was to be preferred because it had a position in nearly every quarter of the globe. The American Missionary Association gave you no chance to preach the gospel in Western or Northern Asia or China, not a missionary, not a native helper. True, the Missionary Association might say, "Give us the money and we will establish missionaries in all these places." This would be like a small firm saying to buyers, Don't go to the large houses, to Claflin & Mellen, or Bowen & McNamee, or Stewart's; come to us; and if we haven't got the stock you want, when we are rich enough, we'll keep on hand all that you want. He preferred the American Board, also, because it was old, and was hallowed by association. It was objected to the American Board that it was a close corporation. He compared its action with that of the American Tract Society, an open corporation, much to the disadvantage of the latter. On the question of slavery, he proceeded to defend the Board. These Indian Missions went back to the time when there was no agitation against slavery. And the Churches then established were independent; their independence, like that of all other Churches under the American Board, being carefully guarded.

Mr. Beecher read from the report of 1854 of the American Board, taking the ground that it was not necessary to exclude the slaveholders from communion. They denounced slavery, but would consider the circumstances of those who, without their own action, had been made slaveholders. One of the missionaries, viewing slavery in all its bearings, denounced its baleful effects upon both masters and slaves. This was the feeling in 1848, and they had not yet learned the doctrine of discrimination between the selfish and unselfish slaveholder. He held that a man might hold a slave and not do wrong. This must be the case until time is annihilated. There might be formalities, and whether they took seconds, days or weeks, time must be consumed. Such a thing as immediate emancipation was impossible.

He did not believe that slaveholding was necessarily sinful. There was no such thing as a thing being bad *per se*, or good *per se*. That was a scholastic subtlety. Nothing was bad *per se*, and nothing was good *per se*. A thing that was bad in its results was bad, and a thing good in its results was good. The question with regard to slavery was whether it was baneful in its influence or not. The American Board has taken this ground: That selfish slaveholding was reprehensible; but if a man were put in circumstances where he could not help it, he was permitted to do so. If a man could not emancipate his slave, he fellowshipped him, and would sit down to table with him, and so would Christ. He would go through fire and water to stand by that man. The Board had done all that they could to enforce these doctrines. But it was not reasonable to ask that the Churches among the Choctaws should become anti-slavery before Dr. Spring's or the Mercer Street Church became so, or half the churches in Brooklyn. Mr. Beecher reviewed the course of the American Board in regard to slavery among the Choctaw Churches. He thought the books of Corinthians the best adaptation of Christian principle to the actual state of things, and next to them he placed Mr. Treat's report on the American Board and Slavery in the Cherokee and Choctaw Churches. Mr. Beecher presented the history of the Board's action in regard to slavery, and read at length from Mr. Wood's report, accepted by the Missionary Churches as their guide in matters pertaining to slavery. If by their vote they withdrew their sympathy from the American Board, they might just as well withdraw it from their pastor, and vote that they would not hear him preach any longer, for he held just such views. Because the missionaries said that they could not bring the Choctaw Churches up to this agreement, the American Board had cut off these Churches. When we looked at the course of the Churches contributing to the American Board, in regard to slavery, we were surprised that the American Board had taken such ground as it had. If there was one form of slavery which he utterly abhorred, it was bigotry for liberty. In the advanced anti-slavery movements of this country there was a bigotry which equalled any Papal intolerance (applause and hisses).

If we may credit the testimony of friends of Mr. Beecher who listened to his speech, its objectionable features are considerably softened in this sketch. We believe, indeed, that a full report would make its unsoundness on the score of principle and its spirit of hostility to radical Anti-Slavery still more apparent. Not Abolitionists only, but pro-slavery conservatives, have regarded and treated it as an evidence of retrogression on the part of Mr. Beecher. While it has pained and surprised many friends of freedom, it has called forth shouts of exultation from the pro-slavery camp. In confirmation of this statement, look at the following

COMMENTS OF THE PRESS.

If we except *The New York Observer*, there is not in all the land a so-called religious journal more unscrupulous and malignant in its opposition to Anti-Slavery, and even to that modified form of it of which Mr. Beecher was aforetime regarded as the representative, than the Dutch Reformed *Christian Intelligencer*. See what it says of Mr. Beecher's speech:

MR. BEECHER'S CONSERVATISM.

When good men forsake their evil ways, the cause of truth is invigorated, righteousness achieves fresh triumphs, and the wicked are put to shame. It has been our painful and melancholy duty, as faithful journalists, to chronicle, in past times, some aberrations of Mr. Beecher from the good old paths the fathers trod; but latterly, we have been disposed to call for the "fatted calf," because this "our brother was lost, but is found again." Ever since the Harper's Ferry foray, the minister of Plymouth Church seems to have kept his eyes wide open, to see what abolitionism is coming to. What Mr. Beecher may have meant for eloquent fun others took up in practical and bloody earnest, and carried war to the gates. As an honest and sagacious man, Mr. Beecher seems to have discovered the necessity which was laid upon him to revise his opinions, and overhaul his previous course of anti-slavery agitation. The result has been every way satisfactory. We find him now opposing Lewis Tappan, and the peripatetic editor of *The Independent*, and the legal acumen of Mr. Benedict, and the fiery phalanx of fanatics in his own Church, on the subject of slavery.

So confident were we of Mr. Beecher's sincere conversion from the ultraist to the conservative side that we ventured our prediction, last week, that he would, on Monday evening last, put the Abolitionists *hors du combat* on the missionary question. Saving a few inconsiderate utterances, his speech was throughout an excellent declaration of conservative principles. We quote a brace of paragraphs, which are so clear and so well pronounced, that, when transferred to our columns, they will be seen to be of the same manner and spirit of opinion which this paper has stiffly and persistently advocated for years. Read Mr. Beecher:

[We need not repeat the extract, as it is embodied in the foregoing report of Mr. Beecher's speech.—*Ed. Standard.*]

That is the sound and wholesome doctrine which our friend, Rev. Harvey D. Ganse, so ably presented years ago in a widely circulated and greatly admired pamphlet, and which the *Christian Intelligencer* endorsed *ex animo et ab corde*. Mr. Beecher, having sown his wild oats, is now getting on to the platform of Dutch conservatism, where he can afford to stand!

"Till rolling years shall cease to move."

Truth is mighty, and will prevail. Modesty forbids us to claim that Mr. Beecher's frequent readings of the *Intelligencer* have done him good, like a medicine; but we have our feelings of encouragement and satisfaction in this case, which will cheer us in our endeavors to aid Brother Cheever, and others like him, who don't know what to do with genteel negroes, when they chance to enter their churches; or with slaveholding ladies, who receive their ministrations under special exceptions.

Mr. Beecher, in his speech of last Monday evening, went further than to denounce the *malum in se* men. He let fly a terrible accusation against the "anti-slavery bigots," which must have sounded like a crack of a Sharp's rifle among the abolition convicts whom the speaker arraigned on Monday evening last. Consider attentively his words.

"He would not countenance the bigotry of anti-slavery men who denounced others who could not come up to their shibboleth. What a condition of things was this, when a man can't say a thing that seems in the least charitable or Christian toward a man who is wrong! He thought the bigotry of anti-slavery in modern days was much like that of the Papacy (applause)."

What will *The Tribune* say to that? and The Anti-Slavery Standard? and the frantic Philistines of New England? We wonder much whether our young convert has not himself felt the iron of abolition insolence and arrogance, to be thus able to hit the nail on the head so exactly and so hard. The truth is, that the most imperious, dictatorial, overbearing and intolerant of men are the anti-slavery bigots. They have divided Christian associations, and disturbed Tract Societies, and split Churches, and proscribed men in high and low stations, because their shibboleth was not adopted. We are right glad that Mr. Beecher has found them out at last, and exposed them so well. It will always afford us sincere pleasure to copy what he may say against "the bigotry of anti-slavery men," who are as much worse than the Papacy as a hundred angry and vindictive little tyrants are worse than one constitutional monarch.

* * * * * * * *

The bold, manly, conservative and Christian position which Mr. Beecher has recently taken with reference to the existing anti slavery agitation has brought down upon him the adverse criticisms of certain ultra journals, whose political override their ethical principles. *We heartily rejoice that Mr. Beecher has, in these exciting times, avowed his hostility to intermeddling Abolitionists and anti-slavery bigots.* For as there is an uncounted multitude of people in the land who borrow their brains, their thoughts, their principles and their utterances from the eloquent and popular minister of Plymouth Church, we can easily see that his example will be studied and imitated by many influential leaders of opinion, both clerical and political. We do not care to recall now what Mr. Beecher may have said or done in former times, in the abolition interest. *It is enough for us to know that, in his riper age, and with his maturer judgment, and fuller observation*, he has deliberately asserted,

1. That a man might hold a slave and not do wrong.
2. That immediate emancipation is impossible.
3. That a slaveholder may be a good Christian.
4. That the influence of slavery is not always evil.
5. That some actual slaveholders are doing more for the cause of freedom than some violent reformers.
6. That anti-slavery bigotry is like that of the Papacy.

These maxims have been enunciated from an honest heart, more devoted to truth than to partisanship, and have secured for him, in this regard, the admiration of all men who can appreciate that real nobility and magnanimity of character which will show themselves, on great occasions, superior to the mousing meanness of little bigots and partisans.

The Express, one of the very worst of the political pro-slavery journals, thus vents its exultation:

The pith of the matter is *the improving position of Mr. Beecher himself* upon the subject of slave-agitation and slavery; for he, like most men, as he grows older, seems to be becoming more conservative, and thus not to have lived in vain. * * * Who shall say, after this, that the Union meetings are not converting even the heathen to moderation and better sense? Anon, under such advancing preaching as this [alluding to Mr. Beecher's speech] the broken bond of the Churches of our country (alas, the fatally broken bond!)—which has done more to dissever this Republic than all the politicians combined—may be restored; and eight millions of Christians in the South may once more be restored to the communion table with the Christians of the North. What the Savior and the Apostles could do, the Abolitionists of the North have not yet been able to do—that is, receive as brethren in the Church slaveholders, as well as non-slaveholders; but, *if the Beechers thus begin to pioneer the way, the good old time may be re-coming, when, once more, we shall be a united people.* Christianity, and Christianity alone—the Christianity of the North, acting in comity and concert with the Christianity of the South—may and can reform everything wrong in slaveholding communities, and, in the end, perhaps, make the slave be fit for that freedom which it would *then* be unjust to deprive him of, but this *holier-than-thou* Christianity of our modern Pharisees is a curse to the country, the slave, the master, and to all society. *The remarks of the pastor of the Plymouth Church show how the current of abolitionism is setting in a better way.*

The Irish News, seeing Mr. Beecher "coming round," is not able to conceal its joy. It says:

Some time ago Mr. Beecher was a great anti-slavery agitator, whereby he stirred up a set of people to go beyond himself. This reverend gentleman once talked in a fierce and formidable vein—King Cambyses vein—and sent a clerical blunderbuss to Kansas with his blessing, his mediations at that time running to the tune of Tennyson's lyric:

"Riflemen, riflemen, riflemen, form!"

But *he knew when to stop.* His disciples don't. There are certain men of his congregation who have set themselves to better his instruction and who will not take his advice any more. Hence two parties in the Church.

Their difference grew out of Borrioboola-Gha—a grand missionary business to bring in the heathens who have been dying darkly, by myriads on myriads, for thousands and thousands of years, under the sole superintendence of Divine Providence. Well, the work of winning over half a dozen of those people would be such a precious help of God's purposes that Mr. Beecher's folk had two Societies, bearing good unctuous names, so like one another that we cannot remember them easily asunder, and so, for clearness, we shall call them the Hard Shell Society and the Soft Shell Society. The Soft Shells, adhering to Mr. Beecher, like barnacles, were for allowing slaveholders in the South to lend a hand in converting the native Americans—the Chickasaws and the other red-skins. The Hard Shells, under Messrs. Tappan and Tilton, are for thrusting those slave-owners out of their communion, neck and crop, as a people utterly unworthy to serve God in the saving of souls, and only fit to be parcelled off in the end with the goats, on the left.

Blessed Brooklyn came down handsomely for those Missionary Societies, and the pious Hards and the Softs fell out over the money—as, indeed, many people without any religion will do also, at times. At first, for quietness, Mr. Beecher divided fair with the Hards, till at last that Sixty sect wanted to have it all for their own special Borrioboola-Gha! This was too much for the Softs, and so the congregation drew off into two camps and fought one another. Messrs. Tappan and Tilton denounced the pastor's falling off from the faith, and one of them, one day, pointed a rifle at the reverend gentleman! He produced a real live gun, and, displaying it, brought Beecher's old rifle harangue to mind. 'Twas a sharp-shooting piece of oratory, founded on good old classic precedent and also reminding one of the great Irishman in the House of Commons when, in execrating the French revolution, he suddenly held up a dagger, the symbol of Gallic progress, to discomfit Charles Fox and his friends.

In the present case, Mr. Beecher was terribly taken aback and jokeless—muttering no doubt to himself, like Macbeth, "Is this a rifle that I see before me, its muzzle towards my own?" The sight must have unmanned him; for though, on a division, he had a victory over the Hard Shells, it was by a frightfully little majority. He felt like Pyrrhus, after the battle of Something-or-other. The fire-arm had the effect of an apparition on his conscience.

After the story, let us have the moral. Our best and strongest minds won't go the whole abolition hog. In quiet times they will be light and loose tongued; but, in the crisis, they come out like bricks for the Union and the welfare of this wonderful family of republics. They stop shrieking and sing Yankee Doodle. Pulpits or journals, it is all the same: good sensible men take their place on the right side and austerely bid their fanatical neighbors shut up. As for Mr. Beecher, we are glad the sight of that deadly weapon gave him remorse. The feeling was a salutary one. But we think well of him and hope good things of him—good things, indeed, of all kinds. *We are sorry Mr. Mitchel is not here. He would rejoice exceedingly to see his old adversary coming round.* He would extend the warm hand of reconciliation, repressing his emotion. It would, in fact, be Dorax and Sebastian over again.

They call Beecher a *trimmer*. Well, perhaps he is. Let him accept the term. Saville Lord Halifax, once upon a time, did the same, and, with a wit as brilliant and happy as Beecher's own, showed that it was a name suitable to a man of the finest sense and judgment, as well in the management of state affairs as in the general conduct of sublunary matters. In sailing over the ocean of life, in fact, the best man trims his ship best. The man who cannot trim, blunders on rocks, falls to pieces, bursts up, goes to Davy Jones's locker. We hope Mr. Beecher's runagates will take heart and grace and come back. If they don't, he may take Dogberry's consolation and be thankful he has got rid of them.

The New York Evangelist, the dim and flickering light of whose anti-slavery is perceptible only as you compare it with the thick darkness of *The Observer*, takes occasion to show that the New School Presbyterian Church is covered by Mr. Beecher's defence of the Board as effectually as Gen. Jackson's army at New Orleans was shielded by the cotton-bags from British bullets. After quoting a passage from the speech, it says:

This was taking strong ground. But the progress of the speech showed that it had not been taken rashly. Mr. Beecher went over the history of the Board for many years, showing how it had met the question of slavery, whenever it came up, frankly and openly, with Christian prudence, but yet with Christian courage and firmness. (!!) * * * While recording this satisfactory statement in regard to the Board, we cannot forbear adding that *the very same line of argument applies with equal or even greater force to the position of the General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian Church*, since it has had to encounter the question more frequently and more obstinately; and that all the objections of the Free Synod against the Assembly, as if it were not anti-slavery enough, are utterly without force. As Mr. Beecher says of the American Board, so may we say triumphantly of the General Assembly, "that it has held and now holds sound anti-slavery doctrines; that it has faithfully and consistently applied these doctrines to its appropriate work; and that it is clean, clear and pure on this whole subject!"

We shall be curious to see what will be said to this speech by the more violent anti-slavery press. It will be a novel state of things if Mr. Beecher is denounced as not anti-slavery enough! But he seems to have made up his mind to receive harsh rebukes from that quarter. Now that anti-slavery has become popular, it requires no small degree of courage and firmness to stop short of the utmost violence.

"Anti-Slavery has become popular," says *The Evangelist*. If it had said that it was popular to offset the practical support and defence of slavery in the Church by *professions* of anti-slavery, it would have come nearer the truth.

Having shown how Mr. Beecher's speech is regarded by the pro-slavery press, we copy the remarks of *The American Baptist*, which will show how it has grieved and mortified earnest anti-slavery men of the orthodox school:

To many it is a source of surprise and mortification that Henry Ward Beecher, who has often been so loud in his denunciation of slavery, should now be found endeavoring to hold back his Church from becoming a real, active anti-slavery body, by sending their missionary funds through a Society which makes slaveholding a bar to fellowship. But the case is one which ought not to excite surprise. Henry Ward Beecher, eloquent for freedom as he sometimes is, has never committed himself to the doctrine of practical separation from the wrong-doer. We know Dr. Cheever has been severely censured for intimating that among the New York ministers of his own order he stood alone, when in point of fact Mr. Beecher and Dr. Thompson were as thoroughly anti-slavery as he. But the statement of Dr. Cheever was strictly true; in his mode of opposing slavery, he stands alone; his abolitionism is totally different from that of Mr. Beecher, as the event has now shown. We become more and more persuaded that the only true test by which to judge the soundness of any man's anti-slavery position is to meet him with the question: Do you believe slavery to be, *in itself*, a sin? And, as such, a bar to admission to the Lord's table? Any Church or Society which evades this issue ought not to be reckoned among the anti slavery ranks; any minister or church-member who professes opposition to slavery as an evil, but does not regard it as a sin worthy of church discipline, is not to be depended upon; in the very hour when his help is needed, he will be found on the wrong side; his influence will be given for the suppression of any efficient anti slavery action. Such, it ought to have been expected, would be the course of Mr. Beecher, when the question was brought up in the Plymouth Church, whether their funds should be given to the American Board or the American Missionary Association.

That we may do no injustice to Mr. Beecher, we copy from last week's *Independent* the following article, in which, after witnessing the effect of his speech, he makes another effort to define his position.

PLYMOUTH CHURCH DISCUSSION.

From the formation of Plymouth church until the beginning of the year 1857—a period of ten years—the Plymouth Church of Brooklyn was accustomed to make an annual collection for Foreign Missions, and to pay the same into the treasury of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. There had never been any known or expressed wish to the contrary.

But, as early as 1855-6, the pastor, at the request of the Treasurer of the American Missionary Association, requested all in the congregation who wished their missionary contributions to go to this last-named Society to signify their wish, and they should be applied; while the rest of the collection would go as always before, to the American Board.

At the annual church meeting, Dec. 17, 1856, the following action took place:

"On motion of Brother Tappan, it was unanimously voted that the money collected for Home Missions in the month of March, not specially designated, shall be equally divided between the American Home Missionary Society and the American Missionary Association, Home Department; and the money collected in the month of October for Foreign Missions, and not specially designated, shall be equally divided between the Foreign Missionary Society and the American Missionary Association, Foreign Department."

This change was made without consultation with the pastor, and without his knowledge, he being absent from the annual business church meeting. Nor was he informed of it until the next missionary collection was taken up.

To this arrangement we objected, as tending to great confusion, and as calculated to diminish the missionary collections, already too small. We proposed putting each Society on its own ground—giving a collection to the Home Missionary Society for itself, to the American Board a collection by itself, and to the American Missionary Association a separate collection for its field. And, for the past year, this has been the substantial operation of things.

In the annual meeting of the Church for 1859, a movement was made to exclude the American Board entirely, and to give the whole missionary collection a more specifically anti-slavery direction. And this was the question that was really at issue. The pastor advocated a separate contribution for each of the three missionary societies, viz., for *the American Board, the Home Missionary Society, and the American Missionary Association.* And this, in the end, was the decision of the Church, and by an overwhelming majority.

And now, what was the point of disagreement? Simply this. A portion of the brethren of the Church regarded the American Board as having, through their missions to the American Indians, such relations to slavery as made it wrong for the Church to countenance them.

The ground taken by the pastor was substantially this.

1. That the holding of slaves, in the spirit of the system of American slavery, and for the intents and purposes of that system, is sinful, and inconsistent with the Christian character; rendering the slaveholder unfit for church-membership, and a proper subject for church discipline if he be already within the Church. And the presumption, in every case, is that a slaveholder is a sinner against God and man, by the act of holding men deprived of their liberty and defrauded of their rights; that the sinfulness of slavery does not consist in the abuse of the system, but in the very operation of it according to its own nature and written laws, as established in the blackest record of Time—the American Slave-Code of Laws.

2. But if in any single case a man can prove that, though he hold the legal relation of slaveholder, it is against his wish and without his moral consent—that he is doing all that the laws or the peculiar circumstances of trust in which he is placed will allow to give his slaves their rights—and that he is preparing them for liberty and training them as if free, except the mere name and compulsory relation of master—then we hold that this man, in so far as slaveholding is concerned, is worthy of confidence, trust and religious fellowship.

We affirm, then, that a slaveholder is either not a Christian or else is living in a sin that makes him a proper subject of moral and church discipline. Every Church should act upon the presumption (just as courts act upon the presumption that taking human life is murder, unless it be specially shown to be justifiable homicide) that a slaveholder is unworthy of church-fellowship. And a clear and satisfactory exception must be made to this rule in every case where a slaveholder is allowed church privileges; and he must make it appear that he holds slaves no longer by his own wish, nor for profit, nor in the spirit of the detestable and accursed slave laws of the American slave States; but that, desiring to free his slaves, he is hindered and prevented, and that, being willing but unable to free them, he conducts himself toward them as if they were free, regarding their rights and interests, and not his own.

3. In discussing the moral nature of slaveholding, we object to the terms *malum in se*, or *bonum in se*. We object, both for philosophical and upon practical reasons, to all arguments upon the nature of moral acts *per se*. Without entering into the merits of this objection, it is sufficient to say that it is better for good men to unite and make war upon slavery as it is, both by its abhorred system of laws, its actual practice, and its unquestionable fruits. There is the gigantic Evil, looming up like some terrific storm, black over half the heavens, and emitting fiery flashes that wither and blast whatever they touch!

All who are of one mind on this subject should unite and coöperate to bring every moral and equitable secular influence to bear against this modern Sodom and Gomorrah. Instead of that, the North is divided up into schools and sections by the force of philosophical niceties. The anti-slavery host are not cordially and enthusiastically coöperative. There is a *doctrinal* spirit among them as high, as exclusive and as foolish as ever there was in the religious world. There is a disposition to punish men for not holding the high anti-slavery creed up to the very letter of philosophical doctrines. And as we have always contended against this fanaticism of doctrine in religious matters, so we consistently abhor the bigotry of it in great questions of philanthropy. We are more than willing that men should ground their own conduct on their own philosophical reasons; but, we hold that all men who are willing, *practically* and *earnestly*, to give their influence against slavery should be united, and that no man should be punished, crippled, or reproached for his honest belief on this subject, any more than for his religious beliefs. We are lovers of freedom in political relations, in moral and philosophical matters, and to the very core of life.

Nothing, therefore, can be further from the truth than the statement of *The N. Y. Tribune*:

"Mr. Beecher made some very extraordinary declarations in his speech on Monday evening. For example: he then declared that nothing was good or bad in itself, and thus that slavery was not a universal wrong. Without embarking upon any metaphysical disquisition, we may at least ask if African slavery, as we know it in the United States and elsewhere, is not a wrong, an infernal wrong, and an accursed nuisance as well? And as this is the practical point in the whole discussion, Mr. Beecher's declaration, which is of very questionable character in connection with it, and which bears against the great truth itself, seems to us to savor of unusual eccentricity."

How far this is from a correct representation will appear from the tenor of this article.

4. In regard to the American Board, we did not attempt a minute account of all the steps by which it had reached its present position. But, through years of gradually increasing explicitness, the Board has at last reached a ground of the most positive and substantive anti-slavery truth.

If the American Board administer their trust in the spirit and according to the doctrines laid down in their latest enunciation, contained in a paper called the *Good Water Agreement*, there can be little doubt that the Board and their missionaries will bring the Gospel to bear upon the subject of slavery in the most thorough and cleansing manner. We give a few points of this Good Water platform:

"1. Slavery, as a system, and, in its own proper nature, is what it is described to be in the General Assembly's Act of 1818, and the Report of the American Board adopted at Brooklyn in 1845.

"2. Deprivation of liberty by holding slaves is, therefore, not to be ranked with things indifferent, but with those which, if not made right by special justificatory circumstances and the intention of the doer, are morally wrong.

"3. Those are to be admitted to the communion of the Church, of whom the missionary and (in Presbyterian Churches) his session have satisfactory evidence that they are in fellowship with Christ.

"4. The evidence, in one view of it, of fellowship with Christ, is a manifested desire and aim to be conformed, in all things, to the spirit and requirements of the Word of God.

"5. Such desire and aim are to be looked for in reference to slavery, slaveholding and dealing with slaves, as in regard to other matters; not less, not more."

The force of the first paragraph cannot be appreciated unless our readers are familiar with the doctrine of this famous act of the Presbyterian Church o 1818. We give, therefore, a portion of it:

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, having taken into consideration the subject of slavery, think proper to make known their sentiments upon it to the Churches and people under their care. We consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature; as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbor as ourselves, and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ, which enjoins that 'all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system; it exhibits rational, accountable and immortal beings in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent on the will of others, whether they shall receive religious instruction; whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the Gospel; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and friends; whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of slavery—consequences not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence. The evils to which the slave is always exposed often take place in fact, and in their very worst degree and form; and where all of them do not take place, as we rejoice to say in many instances, through the influence of the principles of humanity and religion on the minds of masters, they do not, still the slave is deprived of his natural right, degraded as a human being, and exposed to the danger of passing into the hands of a master who may inflict upon him all the hardships and injuries which inhumanity and avarice may suggest."

If the American Board hold its missionaries responsible for the preaching of a gospel as anti-slavery as these documents indicate, is it wise for Churches now, at length, to greet this growth and fruit of long discussion and influence with distrust and rejection? Is this the reward and encouragement of those who come to the light?

Great pains have been taken to spread abroad the rumor that we have changed our ground, and receded from former anti-slavery opinions. It is needless to say that we have given up nothing, changed nothing, except as a bud changes to a blossom, and a blossom to a fruit. We never abhorred slavery so much. We never more dreaded its malignant influences both upon white and black, upon civil and religious institutions. We never were more invincibly determined to make no terms with it, but to carry on legitimate war to the end and destruction of it.

But, for that very sake, we shall refuse a zeal without knowledge, and all bigotry of anti slavery feeling, and all attempts to punish men for variation of belief on anti-slavery doctrine.

Advertisements.

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS. The following works on Slavery are for sale at this Office. The price of each, as well as that for which it will be forwarded by mail, is given below:

	Price.	By mail.
Autobiography of a Female Slave,	$1 00	1 02
Abolitionism Exposed and Corrected,	15	17
Address to the Presbyterians of Kentucky,	3	
Address of Wm. Lloyd Garrison, August 1, 1854,	10	14
Address of Theodore Parker, State House,	17	20
A Collection of Valuable Documents,	16	18
American Chattelized Humanity. By Jona. Walker,	10	16
Anti-Slavery Alphabet,	8	10
Appeal to the Women of the Nominally Free States. By Angelina G. Weld,	15	17
Argument of Wendell Phillips for Removing Judge Loring,	10	10
Authentic Anecdotes of American Slavery. By L. Maria Child,	5	4
Branded Hand. By Jona. Walker,	23	25
Channing's Letter to Abolitionists,	10	12
Chattanooga,	1 00	1 15
Considerations Addressed to the Laity of the P. E. Church. By a Layman,	8	10
Cousin Ann's Stories for Children,	8	10
Derby Lecture. By Wm. H. Furness,	8	10
Despotism in America. By R. Hildreth (unbound),	28	40
Eulogy on Thos. Clarkson. By Prof. C. L. Reason,	15	17
Facts in the Life of Gen. Taylor,	20	23
History of the Struggle for Slavery Extension. By Horace Greeley,	20	23
Shamah, in Pursuit of Freedom,	1 25	1 43
Legion of Liberty,	50	63
Liberty Bell for 1858,	1 00	1 18
Mason Hodges (for children),	10	10
Manifest Destiny of the American Union,	10	10
Proceedings of Woman's Rights Convention, 1853,	25	28
Pinda—a True Tale. By Maria Weston Chapman,	10	10
Proceedings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, Second Decade Celebration	20	20
Parker's Defence in the Burns Slave Case,	1 00	1 15
Proceedings of Worcester Disunion Convention,	20	23
Review of Webster. By Theodore Parker,	10	10
Review of Webster. By Wendell Phillips,	10	10
Report of the Anti-Slavery Bazaar, 1858,	6	7
Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society, 1858,	25	25
Stroud's Sketch of Slave Laws,	16	22
Sketches of Places and People Abroad. By William Wells Brown,	75	9
The same (paper covers),	50	58

Persons wishing to order any of the above publications by mail should enclose the price, including postage, in a letter addressed to the American Anti-Slavery Society, 138 Nassau street, New York.

JUST PUBLISHED,

THE JOHN BROWN INVASION;

AN AUTHENTIC HISTORY

OF THE

HARPER'S FERRY TRAGEDY,

WITH FULL DETAILS OF THE

CAPTURE, TRIAL AND EXECUTION OF THE INVADERS,

and of all the incidents connected therewith, with a perfect LITHOGRAPH PORTRAIT of Captain John Brown, from a Photograph by Whipple.

PRICE 25 CENTS.

Published by JAMES CAMPBELL, 62 and 64 CORNHILL, BOSTON; H. DEXTER & CO., New York, and for sale by Periodical Dealers. Sent by mail, postage paid, on receipt of the above.

AGENTS WANTED

in every County in New York and in the West, to whom the most liberal terms will be allowed.

IVY INSTITUTE FOR YOUNG LADIES, Pughtown, Chester Co., Pa. The location of this Institution is healthful and pleasant. In it are taught the branches which pertain to an English education, together with the French Language, Music and Drawing. The school year is divided into three terms, of fourteen weeks each. The winter term will commence the 12th of December, 1859. At the close of this term, there will be a vacation of two weeks.

Pupils are admitted at any time during the term, and, when desired, can remain at the School during the vacations.

For further particulars address
JESSE HAWLEY, PROPRIETOR, Pughtown, Chester Co., Pa.

STROUD'S SKETCH OF THE LAWS RELATING TO SLAVERY, for sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, 138 Nassau street. Price 16 cents. Every friend of freedom should have a copy of this work and make himself familiar with its contents.

Philadelphia Advertisements.

BOARDING HOUSE.—Respectable persons can be accommodated with genteel boarding, transient or permanent, by applying to the subscriber, No. 632 South street, below Ninth, Philadelphia.
WILLIAM STILL.

CARD.—ANNA M. LONGSHORE POTTS, M. D., Practising Physician, No. 661 North-Tenth street, Philadelphia, Pa. All cases in Medicine and Surgery treated with the most approved remedies, and most modern aids and appliances known to the science. Especial attention given to Obstetrics and diseases of women and children.

FURNITURE.—Purchasers are respectfully invited to call at the Cabinet Warerooms of Schott & Heacock No. 142 North Ninth street, below Race, Philadelphia. Spring and Hair Mattresses made to order. Repairing, Varnishing, Upholstering, &c., &c. All orders promptly attended to.

KENDERDINE & JUSTICE, Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic HARDWARE, S. W. corner Spring Garden and Seventh streets, Phila. Constantly on hand a general assortment of Hardware, Cutlery &c., at the lowest cash prices, wholesale or retail. Particular attention paid to furnishing Hardware for buildings.
JOSEPH H. KENDERDINE, | WARNER JUSTICE.

CONFECTIONERY—REMOVAL.—Leatitia Bullock, respectfully informs her friends and the public that she has removed to No. 152 North Sixth street, below Race, opposite the old stand, where she is prepared to furnish Ice Creams, Water Ices, Jellies, Cakes, Candies, &c., of every description and of the best materials, all the produce of Free Labour, and warranted to give entire satisfaction. Parties and families furnished at shortest notice. Orders sent to any part of the city.

PRIZE MEDAL awarded in London, in 1851, for his superiority over all others in the manufacture of Travelling Trunks; Carpet Bags, Valises, Gum Shoes, Coachel Hobby Horses, and sole leather, steel spring, iron frame, iron-bound Trunks of all descriptions, of the best materials and workmanship. Black Leather Enamelled Bags, at the lowest prices.
THOS. W. MATTSON, Trunk Manufacturer,
130 Market street, S. W. cor. 4th, Philadelphia.

A LARGE assortment of SALAMANDER SAFES, of various sizes, always on hand, at No. 26 South Fourth street Philadelphia. Warranted equal to any made in the United States. EVANS & WATSON, thankful for past favours, respectfully solicit continuance of the same. Please give us a call before purchasing elsewhere. Patent slate-lined Refrigerators, Water Filters, &c. A large assortment always on hand.
N. B. Sole Agency for Butterworth's celebrated Bank Vault and Door Locks. These locks bid defiance to all lockpicks, Hobbs included.

SIGN of the MAMMOTH PEN, No. 72 N. Fourth street (2d door below Arch), Phila., wholesale and retail Stationery, Blank Books, &c., which we will sell lower than the usual prices, English, French and American Cap, Letter and Note Papers, Envelopes, Sealing Wax, plain and fancy Wafers of every description, very superior Gold and Steel Pens, Ink and Inkstands, Sand Boxes, Wafer Cups, Paper Weights, plain and fancy Pen-holders, Drawing Pencils and Books, Bristol Board, Tracing Paper, Impression Paper, Tissue Paper. Visiting and Wedding Cards, Pocket Books, Portfolios, Bankers' Cases, Diaries, &c., Envelopes at 10 cents per 100 and 96 cents per 1000, *Mercantile Firms, Insurance Co., Banks*, &c., furnished with Blank Books, to order of the best materials and workmanship.
CLOTHIER & PEDRICK,
72 N. Fourth street, below Arch street.

TO THOSE WHO ARE UNWILLING TO SUPPORT SLAVERY.—During the last twelve years a store of free labor goods has been kept at the N. W. corner of Fifth and Cherry streets in this city, for the convenience of those who wish to avoid the use of the fruits of slavery. It will scarcely be denied that the rejection of slave labor cotton, sugar and rice is a good testimony against slavery—fully as influential against that system as a refusal to pay militia fines or to purchase prize goods is against war. Will not those who are willing to make a sacrifice, if need be, to sustain their convictions on the latter subject, lend their influence in like manner against slavery? This is the only Grocery kept by a Friend in the city. Much care is taken to keep good Sugars, Syrups, Molasses, Coffees, Teas, Cocoa, Chocolate, Rice, Spices, Fruit, &c., and a variety of Dry Goods. The proprietor aims to sell as low as he can to sustain the business. With double the patronage, prices could be somewhat reduced; probably every article could be sold as low as similar goods in the market. Many are so sold now. Those who favor the Store with their custom, and procure their Teas, Coffees, Spices, Chocolate and Cocoa, &c., will find the articles good, and free from adulteration. On hand, Dried Peaches of superior quality.
GEORGE W. TAYLOR.

Equality to all! Uniformity of Prices! A new feature in Business Every one his own Salesman.

JONES & Co., of the Crescent One Price Clothing Store No. 200 Market street, above 6th, in addition to having the largest, most varied and fashionable stock of Clothing in Philadelphia made expressly for retail sales, have constituted every one his own salesman, by having marked in figures, on each article, the very lowest price it can be sold for, so they cannot possibly vary—all must buy alike. The goods are all well sponged and prepared, and great pains taken with the making, so that all can buy with the full assurance of getting a good article at the very lowest price!
Remember the Crescent in Market, above 6th, No. 200 Phila.
JONES & CO.